arXiv:1608.00107v1 [stat.ME] 30 Jul 2016

Constructing Likelihood Functions for Interval-valued Random Variables

X. Zhang*† S. A. Sisson*

Abstract

There is a growing need for the ability to analyse interval-valued data. However, existing descriptive frameworks to achieve this ignore the process by which interval-valued data are typically constructed; namely by the aggregation of real-valued data generated from some underlying process. In this article we develop the foundations of likelihood based statistical inference for random intervals that directly incorporates the underlying generative procedure into the analysis. That is, it permits the direct fitting of models for the underlying real-valued data given only the random interval-valued summaries. This generative approach overcomes several problems associated with existing methods, including the rarely satisfied assumption of within-interval uniformity. The new methods are illustrated by simulated and real data analyses.

Keywords: Likelihood theory; Imprecise data; Interval data; Symbolic data analysis.

1 Introduction

As we move inevitably towards a more data-centric society, there is a growing need for the ability to analyse data that are constructed in non-standard forms, rather than represented as continuous points in $\mathbb{R}^p$ (Billard and Diday, 2003). The simplest and most popular of these is interval-valued data.

Interval-valued observations can arise naturally through the data recording process, and essentially result as a way to characterise measurement error or uncertainty of an observation. Examples include blood pressure, which is typically reported as an interval due to the inherent continual changes within an individual (Billard and Diday, 2006); data quantisation, such as rounding or truncation, which results in observations being known to lie within some interval (McLachlan and Jones, 1988; Vardeman and Lee, 2005); and the expression of expert-elicited intervals that contain some quantity of interest (Fisher et al., 2015), among others.

The use of intervals as a summary representation of a collection of classical real-valued data is also rapidly gaining traction. Here the aggregation of a large and complex dataset

*School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of New South Wales, Sydney 2052 Australia.
†Communicating Author: x.zhn421@yahoo.com

into a smaller collection of suitably constructed intervals can enable a statistical analysis that would otherwise be computationally unviable (Billard and Diday, 2003). Where interest in the outcome of an analysis exists at the level of a group, rather than at an individual level, interval-valued data provide a convenient group-level aggregation device (Neto and Carvalho, 2010; Noirhomme-Fraiture and Brito, 2011). Similarly, aggregation of individual observations within an interval structure allows for some preservation of privacy for the individual (Domingues et al., 2010).

The earliest systematic study of interval-valued data is in numerical analysis, where Moore (1966) used intervals as a description for imprecise data. Random intervals can be considered as a special case of random sets (Molchanov, 2005), the theory of which brings together elements of topology, convex geometry, and probability theory to develop a coherent mathematical framework for their analysis. Matheron (1975) gave the first self-contained development of statistical models for random sets, including central limit theorems and a law of large numbers, and Beresteanu and Molinari (2008) derived these limit theorems specifically for random intervals. In this framework, interval-valued random variables $[X] = \left[\underline{X}, \overline{X}\right]$ are modelled as a bivariate real-valued random vector $\left(\underline{X}, \overline{X}\right)$, where $\underline{X} \leq \overline{X}$, using standard inferential techniques. This approach is also used for partially identified models (Beresteanu et al., 2012; Molchanov and Molinari, 2014), where the object of economic and statistical interest is a set rather than a point. In probabilistic modelling, Lyashenko (1983) introduced normal random compact convex sets in Euclidean space, and showed that a normal random interval is simply a Gaussian displacement of a fixed closed bounded interval. Sun and Ralescu (2014) subsequently extended this idea to normal hierarchical models for random intervals.

A more popular framework for the analysis of interval-valued data, and one which we focus on here, is symbolic data analysis (Diday, 1987). Symbols can be considered as distributions of real-valued data points in $\mathbb{R}^p$, such as intervals and histograms, or more general structures including lists. They are typically constructed as the aggregation into summary form of real-valued data within some group, and so the symbol is interpreted as taking values as described by the summary distribution. As a result, symbols have internal variations and structures which do not exist in real-valued data, and methods for analysing them must account for within-symbol variation in addition to between symbol variation. In practice, the most common form of symbol is the random interval or its p-dimensional extension, the p-hypercube. See Billard and Diday (2003, 2006); Noirhomme-Fraiture and Brito (2011) for a review of recent results.

While many exploratory and descriptive data analysis techniques for symbolic data have been developed (see e.g. Billard, 2007, for an overview), there is a paucity of results for developing a robust statistical inferential framework for these data. The most significant of these (Le-Rademacher and Billard, 2011) maps the parameterisation of the symbol into a real-valued random vector, and then uses the standard likelihood framework to specify a suitable model. In the random interval setting, this is equivalent to the random set theory approach by modelling the random set $[X] = \left[\underline{X}, \overline{X}\right]$ by the constrained real-valued random vector $\left(\underline{X}, \overline{X}\right)$ or, more commonly, a reparameterisation to the unconstrained interval centre and half-range $(X_c, X_r) = \left((\underline{X} + \overline{X})/2, (\overline{X} - \underline{X})/2\right)$,

which is then more easily modelled, e.g. $(X_c, \log X_r) \sim N_2(\mu, \Sigma)$. This likelihood framework has been used for the analysis of variance (Brito and Duarte Silva, 2012), time series forecasting (Arroyo et al., 2010) and interval-based regression models (Xu, 2010) among others.

While sensible, by nature the above methods for modelling real-valued random variables only permit descriptive modelling at the level of the real-valued random vector $(\underline{X}, \overline{X})$ (or its equivalent for p-hypercubes). However this descriptive approach completely ignores the generative procedure commonly assumed and implemented for the construction of observed intervals; namely that the underlying real-valued data are produced from some generative model $X_1, \ldots, X_m \sim f(x_1, \ldots, x_m|\theta)$, and the interval is then constructed via some aggregation process, e.g. $\underline{X} = \min_k\{X_k\}$ and $\overline{X} = \max_k\{X_k\}$. If interest is then in fitting the generative model $f(x_1, \ldots, x_m|\theta)$ for inferential or predictive purposes, while only observing the random intervals rather than the underlying real-valued dataset, or in having the interpretation of model parameters be independent of the form of the interval construction process, then the above descriptive models will be inadequate. Further, the existing descriptive models for random intervals typically assume that the distribution of latent data points within the random interval is uniform. Under the above generative procedure, except in specific cases this will almost always be untrue, and this is generally accepted as a false assumption in practice.

In this article we develop the theoretical and methodological foundations of statistical models for random intervals that are directly constructed from an assumed generative model $f(x_1, \ldots, x_m|\theta)$ and a data aggregation function $\varphi(\cdot)$ that maps the space of real-valued data to the space of intervals.

To the best of our knowledge, this represents the first attempt to move beyond the restrictive descriptive models which are prevalent in the literature, and provide an inferential framework that aligns with the generative interval-construction process that is typical in practice. In addition to providing more directly interpretable parameters, it also provides a natural mechanism for departure from the uncomfortable uniformity-within-intervals assumption of descriptive models.

After establishing a measurable space for a random interval $[X]$ in Section 2 (of which, Section 2.1 may be omitted on a first reading), we construct both distribution functions, $F_{[X]}(\cdot)$, and density functions, $f_{[X]}(\cdot)$, for random intervals on this space based on the idea of containment functionals (Molchanov, 2005). From this we are able to establish that the current practice of modelling random intervals, by the bivariate real-valued random vector $(\underline{X}, \overline{X})$, is a valid procedure under this framework. In Section 3, these results naturally lead to the construction of likelihood functions for generative models that are directly constructed from likelihood functions for the underlying real-valued data. This approach is evidenced by the recovery of existing results on the distribution of the order statistics of a random sample under certain conditions. We are also able to show that a limiting case of the derived generative models results in a valid descriptive model, implying that existing descriptive models in fact have a direct interpretation in terms of an underlying generative model.

All results are naturally extended from random intervals to random p-hypercubes

in Section 4. In Section 5, we contrast the performance of generative and descriptive models for interval-valued random variables on both simulated data, and for a reanalysis of a credit card dataset previously examined by Brito and Duarte Silva (2012). Here we establish that the use of existing descriptive models to analyse interval data constructed under a generative process (which is typical in practice), can result in misinterpretable and biased parameter estimates, and poorer overall fits to the observed interval data than those obtained under generative models. Finally, we conclude with a discussion.

2 Distributions of Random Intervals

We begin by establishing the measurable space of $\mathbb{I} = \{[x, y] \colon -\infty < x \leq y < +\infty\}$ for a random closed[1] interval $[X] = [\underline{X}, \overline{X}]$ before constructing distribution and density functions on this space. Throughout we denote Ω as a sample space equipped with a σ-algebra $\mathscr{F}$ w.r.t. a probability measure $P(\cdot)$. We denote a vector of $m < \infty$ real-valued random variables by $X_{1:m} = (X_1, \ldots, X_m)^\intercal$, where $X_k \colon \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, m$, and x_k is a realisation of X_k. We can then define a data aggregation function $\varphi \colon \mathbb{R}^m \mapsto \mathbb{I}$ that maps a vector $X_{1:m}$ to the space of intervals $\mathbb{I}$ via $[X] = \varphi(X_{1:m})$, so that $[X]$ is a random (closed) interval. For example, a useful specification for random intervals might construct the bivariate real-valued random variable $(\underline{X}, \overline{X})$ from the minimum $(\underline{X})$ and maximum $(\overline{X})$ of the components of $X_{1:m}$.

2.1 Constructing a measurable space

In order to construct a measurable space of $\mathbb{I}$, we identify those subsets of $\mathbb{I}$, which are equivalent to particular subsets of $\mathbb{R}^m$. A subset of interest is $\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\} = \{[x'] : [x'] \subseteq [x]\}$, which corresponds to the collection of all intervals that are a subinterval of or equal to $[x]$. This subset is the image of the event $\{[X] \subseteq [x]\} = \{\omega \in \Omega : [X](\omega) \subseteq [x]\}$ on $\mathbb{I}$. $\{[X] \subseteq [x]\}$ may also be written as $\{\varphi(X_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\} = \{\omega \in \Omega : \varphi(X_{1:m}(\omega)) \subseteq [x]\}$, of which the image on $\mathbb{R}^m$ is $\{\varphi(x'_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\} = \{x'_{1:m} : \varphi(x'_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\}$, i.e. the subset of $\mathbb{R}^m$ containing those $x'_{1:m}$ that can generate an interval which is a subinterval of or equal to $[x]$. The two subsets $\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}$ and $\{\varphi(x'_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\}$ are equivalent as their pre-images on Ω are identical. As a result, given a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^m$, the probability of $\{\varphi(x'_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\}$, and hence of $\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}$, can be calculated if only if it is measurable. This implies that in a measurable space of $\mathbb{I}$, $\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}$ should be measurable.

We construct the metric topology on $\mathbb{I}$, denoted by $\mathscr{T}_\mathbb{I}$, induced by the Hausdorff metric, which specifies the distance between elements $[a]$ and $[b]$ as

$$d_H([a], [b]) = \max\left\{|\underline{a} - \underline{b}|, |\overline{a} - \overline{b}|\right\},$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes absolute value. If we consider the mapping $h([x]) = (\underline{x}, \overline{x})$ from $\mathbb{I}$ to $\mathbb{R}^2$, then we have $d_2\left((\underline{a}, \overline{a}), (\underline{b}, \overline{b})\right) = d_H([a], [b])$ for any $[a], [b] \in \mathbb{I}$, where $d_2(\cdot)$ is the square metric on $\mathbb{R}^2$. That is, h is a distance preserving map, or isometry, and hence $(\mathbb{I}, \mathscr{T}_\mathbb{I})$ is

[1] Throughout this paper, we only consider closed intervals (hypercubes). Results for other types of intervals (hypercubes) can be obtained in a similar way.

isometrically embedded into the metric topological space on $\mathbb{R}^2$ induced by $d_2(\cdot)$, which is also known as the standard topology.[2] This implies that $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ inherits properties of the standard topology on $\mathbb{R}^2$, such as completeness, local compactness and separability. (See Appendix A for details)

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\} \colon [x] \in \mathbb{I}\}$ be the collection of subsets of interest. We can now construct a measurable space involving $\mathcal{F}$ from the topology $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$. Let $\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$ be the smallest σ-algebra containing all open subsets $\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}} = \sigma(\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}})$, i.e. the Borel σ-algebra on $\mathbb{I}$.[3] This Borel σ-algebra contains $\mathcal{F}$, as all elements of $\mathcal{F}$ are closures of some elements of $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ (Appendix A). The following theorem provides the stronger result that $\mathcal{F}$ is sufficient to construct $\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$.

Theorem 1. *The Borel σ-algebra on $\mathbb{I}$ is the smallest σ-algebra generated by $\mathcal{F}$, i.e. $\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}} = \sigma(\mathcal{F})$. (Proof in Appendix B.1)*

This property indicates that $\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$ is rich enough to ensure that all elements in $\mathcal{F}$ are measurable. It also suggests that if we only define a proper non-negative function on $\mathcal{F}$, we can extend it to a measure on $(\mathbb{I}, \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}})$. In particular, if the induced measure is a probability measure, it would then be the distribution function of $[X]$.

Based on the isometry $h([x]) = (\underline{x}, \overline{x})$ between $\mathbb{I}$ and $\mathbb{R}^2$, we now construct a measure on $(\mathbb{I}, \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}})$, representing the uniform measure on $\mathbb{I}$, which gives equal weight to all intervals.

Let the Borel σ-algebra on $\mathbb{R}^2$ be $\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{R}^2}$, and $\mu \colon \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mapsto [0, +\infty)$ be the Lebesgue measure on $(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{R}^2})$. Due to the isometry $h([x]) = (\underline{x}, \overline{x})$, we then have that $\mu_{\mathbb{I}} = \mu \circ h$ is the uniform measure on $(\mathbb{I}, \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}})$. Consequently, the uniform measure of every Borel subset of $\mathbb{I}$ can be calculated via $\mu(\cdot)$ and $h(\cdot)$. Specifically, for every element of $\mathcal{F}$, we have

$$\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = \mu(h(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\})) = \frac{1}{2}(\overline{x} - \underline{x})^2,$$

as $h(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = \{(\underline{x}', \overline{x}') \colon \underline{x} \leq \underline{x}' \leq \overline{x}' \leq \overline{x}\}$ is the region of an isosceles right triangle on the real plane. From Theorem 1, the uniform measure of all Borel subsets $E \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$ is also available.

Theorem 2. *Define the infinitesimal neighbourhood of $[x]$ as*

$$\mathrm{d}[x] = \{[x'] \in \mathbb{I} \mid \underline{x} - \mathrm{d}\underline{x} < \underline{x}' \leq \underline{x} \leq \overline{x} \leq \overline{x}' < \overline{x} + \mathrm{d}\overline{x}\},$$

where $\mathrm{d}\underline{x}, \mathrm{d}\overline{x} > 0$. Its uniform measure is $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathrm{d}\,[x]) = \mathrm{d}\underline{x} \times \mathrm{d}\overline{x}$. (Proof in Appendix B.2)

From the above we note that $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\cdot)$ is a non-atomic measure, i.e. $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\{[x]\}) = 0$, where $\{[x]\}$ is a set containing a single interval $[x]$. Further, there is a convenient way to compute the value of $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\cdot)$ for any Borel subsets via the Lebesgue integration on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Namely, for any subsets $E \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$

$$\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(E) = \int_E \mu_{\mathbb{I}}\left(\mathrm{d}\,[x]\right) = \iint_{h(E)} \mathrm{d}\underline{x}\mathrm{d}\overline{x}.$$

[2] The standard topology on $\mathbb{R}^2$ is generated by the open rectangles (Munkres, 2000).

[3] The topology $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ is the collection of all open subsets of $\mathbb{I}$, and the Borel σ-algebra is the smallest σ-algebra containing all open subsets (Munkres, 2000).

Accordingly, through such isometry, the measurable space of intervals $(\mathbb{I}, \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}})$ inherits the convenient structure and properties of the real plane. These results permit the construction of distribution and density functions of random intervals.

2.2 Containment distribution functions

In random set theory (Molchanov, 2005; Molchanov and Molinari, 2014), two types of functionals, the capacity functional, $T_{[X]}([x]) = P([X] \cap [x])$, and the containment functional, $C^{\star}_{[X]}([x]) = P([X] \subset [x])$, are commonly used to identify a unique probability measure on $(\mathbb{I}, \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}})$. In the present setting, we consider a variant of the containment functional, $C_{[X]}([x]) = P([X] \subseteq [x])$, which is more convenient for theoretical development and model construction. Due to the similarity of $C^{\star}_{[X]}(\cdot)$ and $C_{[X]}(\cdot)$ in both functionality and interpretation, we still refer to $C_{[X]}(\cdot)$ as the containment functional throughout this article.

Similar to $C^{\star}_{[X]}(\cdot)$, a *containment functional* of a random interval $[X]$ is a functional $C_{[X]} \colon \mathbb{I} \mapsto [0,1]$ having the following properties:

i) $C_{[X]}([\underline{x}, \overline{x}]) \to 1$, when $\underline{x} \to -\infty$ and $\overline{x} \to +\infty$;

ii) If $[x_1] \supseteq [x_2] \supseteq \cdots \supseteq [x_n] \supseteq \cdots$ and $\cap_{n=1}^{\infty}[x_n] \in \mathbb{I}$, then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} C_{[X]}([x_n]) = C_{[X]}(\cap_{n=1}^{\infty}[x_n]);$$

iii) For any $[x] \subseteq [y]$, $C_{[X]}([x]) \leq C_{[X]}([y])$ and

$$C_{[X]}([y]) - C_{[X]}([\underline{y}, \overline{x}]) - C_{[X]}([\underline{x}, \overline{y}]) + C_{[X]}([x]) \geq 0.$$

Based on these properties we can establish the following result.

Theorem 3. *Let $[X] \colon \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{I}$ be a measurable function defined on the sample space $(\Omega, \mathscr{F})$ and $\sigma([X]) \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ be the σ-algebra generated by $[X]$. The containment functional $C_{[X]} \colon \mathbb{I} \mapsto [0,1]$ determines a unique probability measure $P \colon \sigma([X]) \mapsto [0,1]$ for $[X]$, such that $P([X] \subseteq [x]) = C_{[X]}([x])$ for all $[x] \in \mathbb{I}$. (Proof in Appendix B.3)*

That is, the containment functional $C_{[X]}(\cdot)$ plays the role of the distribution function of $[X]$. However, it is more convenient to work with functions defined on the real plane, so we equivalently define the *containment distribution function* as $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}) = C_{[X]}([x])$.

Definition 1. The containment distribution function $F_{[\mathrm{X}]} \colon \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto [0,1]$ of the random interval $[X]$ has the following properties:

i) $F_{[X]}(-\infty, +\infty) = 1$ and $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}) = 0$ when $\underline{x} > \overline{x}$;

ii) $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$ is left-continuous in $\underline{x}$ and right-continuous in $\overline{x}$;

iii) $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$ is non-increasing in $\underline{x}$, and non-decreasing in $\overline{x}$;

iv) For $\underline{y} \leq \underline{x} \leq \overline{x} \leq \overline{y}$, $F_{[X]}(\underline{y}, \overline{y}) - F_{[X]}(\underline{y}, \overline{x}) - F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{y}) + F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}) \geq 0$.

From the above, $1 - F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, +\infty)$ and $F_{[X]}(-\infty, \overline{x})$ are the marginal cumulative distribution functions of the lower bound $\underline{X}$ and the upper bound $\overline{X}$, respectively. In addition, $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$ can also be naturally constructed from the generative framework, where $[X] = \varphi(X_{1:m})$, by noting that the two events of Ω, $\{\varphi(X_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\}$ and $\{[X] \subseteq [x]\}$, are equal. If φ is measurable, we may compute the probability of $\{[X] \subseteq [x]\}$ via $P(\varphi(X_{1:m}) \subseteq [x])$, given the distribution of latent data points $X_{1:m}$. Accordingly, the containment distribution function of $[X]$ can be constructed as

$$F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}) = P(\varphi(X_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]). \tag{1}$$

Intuitively, for $m > 2$, the distribution of $[X] = \varphi(X_{1:m})$ carries less information than the joint distribution of latent data points $X_{1:m}$, due to the data aggregation. More precisely, we may rewrite the σ-algebra generated by $[X]$ as $\sigma(\varphi(X_{1:m})) = X_{1:m}^{-1}(\sigma(\varphi))$, where $\sigma(\varphi)$ is the σ-algebra on $\mathbb{R}^m$ generated by φ and $X_{1:m}^{-1}$ is the inverse map of $X_{1:m}$. As φ is measurable, $\sigma(\varphi) \subseteq \mathscr{B}_{\mathrm{R}^m}$ and $\sigma([X]) = X_{1:m}^{-1}(\sigma(\varphi)) \subseteq X_{1:m}^{-1}(\mathscr{B}_{\mathrm{R}^m})$, where the last term is the σ-algebra generated by $X_{1:m}$. Hence, we have $\sigma([X]) \subseteq \sigma(X_{1:m})$.

Note that $[X]$ degenerates to a scalar random variable when it only contains a single point, i.e. when $\underline{X} = \overline{X} = X$, and so $P([X] \subseteq [x]) = P(X \in [x])$ identifies the distribution of a univariate real-valued random variable. In the generative framework, a univariate real-valued random variable is produced when either $m = 1$, or when $X_1 = \cdots = X_m = X$ for $m > 1$. Accordingly, this theory for random intervals is consistent with standard statistical theory.

For the following sections we assume that the data aggregation function $\varphi(\cdot)$ is always measurable.

2.3 Density functions

The density function of $[X]$ is formally defined as the Radon-Nikodym derivative (Durrett, 2010) of a probability measure on $\mathbb{I}$ over the uniform measure $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\cdot)$ as the reference measure.

Theorem 4. *Let $F_{[X]} \colon \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto [0, 1]$ be the containment distribution function of a random interval $[X]$. If $F_{[X]}(\cdot)$ is twice differentiable, then the density function of $[X]$ is*

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}) = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \underline{x} \partial \overline{x}} F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}). \tag{2}$$

(Proof in Appendix B.4)

From Definition 1, we have that $f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$ is a non-negative function and $f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}) = 0$ when $\underline{x} > \overline{x}$. Conversely, the containment distribution function of $[X]$ can be obtained by integration of a valid density function.

Theorem 5. *A non-negative function* $f_{[X]}\colon \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ *is the density function of a random interval* $[X]$ *with the containment distribution function* $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}) = \int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}} \int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}} f_{[X]}(\underline{x}', \overline{x}')\, \mathrm{d}\underline{x}'\mathrm{d}\overline{x}'$ *if and only if it satisfies* $f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}) = 0$ *when* $\underline{x} > \overline{x}$*, and* $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x})\, \mathrm{d}\underline{x}\mathrm{d}\overline{x} = 1$. *(Proof in Appendix B.5)*

Note that a valid density function of $[X]$ is also a density function for a bivariate real-valued random variable. Being able to express the density function $f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$ of the random interval $[X]$ as the joint density of two real-valued random variables, $\underline{X}$ and $\overline{X}$, justifies those existing (descriptive) methods for modelling random intervals (e.g. Arroyo et al., 2010; Le-Rademacher and Billard, 2011; Brito and Duarte Silva, 2012, see Section 3.1) that directly specify a joint distribution for $\underline{X}, \overline{X} | \underline{X} \leq \overline{X}$, or some reparameterisation that circumvents bounding the parameter space.

3 Likelihood Functions and Models

Theorem 5 implies that one approach for constructing models for $[X]$ is by constructing models for the two real-valued random variables $\underline{X}$ and $\overline{X}$ with $\underline{X} \leq \overline{X}$. We term this approach the *descriptive model*. While it can describe the structure and variation between intervals, it is unable to model the distribution of latent data points within an interval, as it is simply a model for the interval endpoints. This approach is almost universal in the symbolic data analysis literature. As an alternative we develop the *generative model*, which is constructed directly at the level of the latent data points $X_{1:m}$ through the data aggregation function $\varphi(\cdot)$. In the following, we use $F_{[X]}(\cdot)$ and $f_{[X]}(\cdot)$ for interval-valued random variables, and $F(\cdot)$ and $f(\cdot)$ for real-valued random variables.

3.1 Descriptive models

A descriptive model treats $[X] = [\underline{X}, \overline{X}]$ as a bivariate real-valued random variable $(\underline{X}, \overline{X})$ with $\underline{X} \leq \overline{X}$. The results in Section 2, demonstrate that the joint density function of $(\underline{X}, \overline{X})$ is a valid density function for a random interval. We write $f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\alpha) = f(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\alpha)$ as the likelihood function of $\left(\underline{X}, \overline{X}\right)$, where $f(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\alpha)$ satisfies both conditions in Theorem 5 and α denotes the parameter vector of interest. Rather than construct models directly on $(\underline{X}, \overline{X})$ with the awkward constraint $\underline{X} \leq \overline{X}$, a simpler approach is to remove this constraint through reparameterisation. For example, defining the interval centre $X_c = \frac{\underline{X}+\overline{X}}{2}$ and half-range $X_r = \frac{\overline{X}-\underline{X}}{2}$, we obtain $f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} g(\frac{\underline{x}+\overline{x}}{2}, \frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2}|\alpha)$, where $g(x_c, x_r|\alpha)$ is a density function for X_c and X_r.

Most existing methods to model random intervals (e.g. Arroyo et al., 2010; Le-Rademacher and Billard, 2011; Brito and Duarte Silva, 2012) can be classified as descriptive models. Their interpretation is simple and they are convenient to use. However, by construction they are only models for interval endpoints, and as a consequence have limitations in providing information about the distribution of the latent data points $X_{1:m}$.

3.2 Generative models

A generative model of the random interval may be constructed bottom up from the distribution of latent data points $X_{1:m}$ and the data aggregation function $\varphi(\cdot)$, based on (1). Here, the random interval $[X]$ is constructed from $X_{1:m}$ and $\varphi(\cdot)$ via $[X] = \varphi(X_{1:m})$. If $f(x_{1:m}|\theta)$ is the likelihood function of the m data points, then from (1) we may form the containment distribution function of $[X]$ as

$$F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\theta, m) = \int_A f(x_{1:m}|\theta)\,\mathrm{d}x_{1:m}, \tag{3}$$

where $A = \{\varphi(x_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\}$ denotes the collection of $x_{1:m}$, for which the corresponding interval is a subset of or equal to $[x]$. If $\varphi(\cdot)$ is continuous, the containment distribution function (3) is twice differentiable, and so from (2) its contribution to the likelihood function would be

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\theta, m) = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \underline{x}\partial \overline{x}} \int_A f(x_{1:m}|\theta)\,\mathrm{d}x_{1:m}. \tag{4}$$

Note that containment distribution functions (3) and density functions (4) of generative models contain a parameter m specifying the number of latent data points within $[X]$.

When m is large, the evaluation of (4) can be challenging as it involves a high dimensional integration. This integration can be simplified in the case where $X_{1:m}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with $X_k \sim f(x|\theta)$ for $k = 1, \ldots, m$. We denote the likelihood function of $[X]$ with the i.i.d. latent data points by

$$f^{\star}_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\theta, m) = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \underline{x}\partial \overline{x}} \int_A \prod_{k=1}^{m} f(x_k|\theta)\,\mathrm{d}x_{1:m}, \tag{5}$$

and term it the *i.i.d. generative model*.

In practice, the data aggregation function $\varphi(\cdot)$ will typically depend on the order statistics of the latent data points, so that $\varphi_{l,u}(x_{1:m}) = [x_{(l)}, x_{(u)}]$, where $x_{(l)}$ and $x_{(u)}$ are respectively the l-th (lower) and u-th (upper) order statistics of $x_{1:m}$. The region for integration in (3) and (4) then becomes $A = \{x_{1:m} \colon \underline{x} \leq x_{(l)} \leq x_{(u)} \leq \overline{x}\}$ – the collection of $x_{1:m}$ for which the l-th order statistic is no less than $\underline{x}$ and the u-th order statistic is no greater than $\overline{x}$. In this case, and for i.i.d. random variables $X_k \sim f(x|\theta)$ for $k = 1, \ldots, m$, the likelihood function (5) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} f^{\star}_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\theta, m, l, u) = {} & \frac{m!}{(l-1)!(u-l-1)!(m-u)!}[F(\underline{x}|\theta)]^{l-1} \\ & \times [F(\overline{x}|\theta) - F(\underline{x}|\theta)]^{u-l-1}[1 - F(\overline{x}|\theta)]^{m-u} f(\underline{x}|\theta) f(\overline{x}|\theta), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $F(x|\theta) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} f(z|\theta)\,\mathrm{d}z$ is the cumulative distribution function of X_k. That is, (5) reduces to (6), which is the joint likelihood function of the l-th and u-th order statistics of m i.i.d. samples. Consequently, if $l/(m+1) \to \underline{p}$ and $u/(m+1) \to \overline{p}$ as $m \to \infty$, the

distribution of $[X]$ converges to a point mass at $[Q(\underline{p};\theta), Q(\overline{p};\theta)]$, where $Q(\cdot;\theta)$ is the quantile function of $f(x|\theta)$.

Further simplification is possible when $[X]$ is constructed from the minimum and maximum values of $X_{1:m}$ (so that $l = 1$ and $u = m$). Here $A = \{x_{1:m} \colon \underline{x} \leq x_k \leq \overline{x},\, k = 1, \ldots, m\}$ is a hypercube in $\mathbb{R}^m$ with identical length in each dimension, and the likelihood function (6) becomes

$$f^{\star\star}_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\theta, m) = m(m-1)[F(\overline{x}|\theta) - F(\underline{x}|\theta)]^{m-2} f(\underline{x}|\theta) f(\overline{x}|\theta). \tag{7}$$

In this case, if the support of $f(x|\theta)$ is bounded on $[a, b]$, then as $m \to \infty$, the distribution of $[X]$ converges to a point mass at $[a, b]$. However, if $f(x|\theta)$ has unbounded support, the distribution of $[X]$ will diverge to $(-\infty, +\infty)$.

From the above we may conclude that for i.i.d. generative models, when m is large, all interval-valued observations will be similar. As in practice we may expect significant variation in interval-valued observations, even for large m, this indicates that the usefulness of an i.i.d. model may be restricted to specific settings.

3.3 Hierarchical generative models

Evaluating the likelihood function (4) of the generative model for general latent distributions $f(x_{1:m}|\theta)$ of latent data points is challenging, except in simplified settings. Here we consider a special class of the generative model for which the latent data points $X_{1:m}$ are exchangeable. This exchangeability leads to a *hierarchical generative model*, which can capture both inter- and intra- interval structure and variability.

Suppose that $X_{1:m}$ are exchangeable, i.e. their joint distribution is invariant to any permutations of $X_{1:m}$. From de Finetti's Theorem (Aldous, 1985), the distribution of $X_{1:m}$ may be represented as a mixture, i.e.

$$P(X_{1:m} \in A) = \int P_\star^{(m)}(X_{1:m} \in A)\, \mu_{P_\star}(\mathrm{d}P_\star), \tag{8}$$

where $\mu_{P_\star}$ is the distribution on the space of all probability measures of $\mathbb{R}$, and $P_\star^{(m)} = \prod_m P_\star$ is the product measure on $\mathbb{R}^m$. In other words, all X_k for $k = 1, \ldots, m$, are i.i.d. from $P_\star$ with $P_\star \sim \mu_{P_\star}$. By recalling from (3) and (4) that $A = \{\varphi(x_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\}$, then the mixture component $P_\star^{(m)}(X_{1:m} \in A)$ equals $P_\star^{(m)}([X] \subseteq [x])$, which is the containment distribution function for an i.i.d. generative model of $[X]$, with $X_k \sim P_\star$ for $k = 1, \ldots, m$ and the same data aggregation function $\varphi(\cdot)$. This means that $P([X] \subseteq [x])$, which equals $P(X_{1:m} \in A)$, may be represented as the mixture of $P_\star^{(m)}([X] \subseteq [x])$ with $P_\star \sim \mu_{P_\star}$, i.e. as a mixture of i.i.d. generative models.

In the following we consider the case when $P_\star$ belongs to some parametric family, so that $\mathrm{d}P_\star = f(x|\theta)\,\mathrm{d}x$. From (8), the joint density function of $X_{1:m}$ is then given by the mixture representation $\int \prod_{k=1}^m f(x_k|\theta)\pi(\theta)\,\mathrm{d}\theta$, where the mixing distribution $\pi(\theta)$ may be non-parametric or parametric $\pi(\theta|\alpha)$ with parameter α. The resulting containment distribution function of $[X]$ is then the mixture of $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\theta, m)$ given in (3), with

$f(x_{1:m}|\theta) = \prod_{k=1}^{m} f(x_k|\theta)$, w.r.t. $\pi(\theta|\alpha)$. If $\varphi(\cdot)$ is continuous, we obtain the likelihood function of such a generative model as

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\alpha, m) = \int f^{\star}_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\theta, m)\pi(\theta|\alpha)\,\mathrm{d}\theta, \tag{9}$$

where $f^{\star}_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\theta, m)$ is the likelihood function of the i.i.d. generative model (5).

In practice, the latent data points $X_{1:m}$ may not be exchangeable. However the data aggregation functional $\varphi(\cdot)$ may be symmetric. Let Γ be the set of all permutations of the indices from 1 to m, and X_γ be the latent data points $X_{1:m}$ permuted according to $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with density function $f(x_\gamma)$. As $\varphi(\cdot)$ is symmetric, $\varphi(x_\gamma) = \varphi(x_{1:m})$ and $[X_\gamma] = \varphi(X_\gamma)$ has the same containment distribution function as $[X]$. As a result, for the exchangeable random variables defined as $Y_{1:m} \sim \frac{1}{m!}\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} f(X_\gamma)$, $[Y] = \varphi(Y_{1:m})$ has the same containment distribution function as $[X]$.

The existence of such $Y_{1:m}$ implies that when the latent data points $X_{1:m}$ are aggregated into intervals $[X]$ by symmetric data aggregation methods, information on the order-related dependence structure will vanish. As a result, it is unnecessary to model the distribution of $X_{1:m}$ with a more complex dependence structure than exchangeability – modelling the exchangeable $Y_{1:m}$ will be sufficient.

Accordingly, for random intervals $[X_1], \ldots, [X_n]$, the generative model (9) can be directly interpreted as the hierarchical model

$$\begin{aligned} [X_i] &= \varphi(X_{i,1:m}) \\ X_{i,k} &\sim f(x|\theta_i),\ k = 1, \ldots, m_i \\ \theta_i &\sim \pi(\theta|\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

with known m_i for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Thus, we term them hierarchical generative models. The contribution to the integrated likelihood (9) for the first two terms is given by $f^{\star}_{[X]}(\underline{x}_i, \overline{x}_i|\theta_i, m_i)$ – the likelihood function of the i.i.d. generative model (5) for the interval-valued observation $[x_i]$, with the density function of each (conditionally) i.i.d. latent data points $X_{i,1:m_i}$ given by $f(x_{i,k}|\theta_i)$ – and where $\pi(\theta|\alpha)$ is the mixing distribution for θ_i given the parameter α. Given such interpretation, $f(x_{i,k}|\theta_i)$ (or θ_i) is the *local* density function (or parameter) for $[X_i]$, while $\pi(\theta|\alpha)$ (or α) is the *global* density function (or parameter) among all intervals. Therefore, the intra-interval structure is described by the local density function and m, while the inter-interval variability is modelled by the global density function.

As a result, inference on this model permits direct analysis of the underlying distribution of data points $X_{1:m}$ within each interval $[X_i]$ and its model parameter θ_i – an advantageous property of the generative model over the descriptive model. For example if the global density $\pi(\theta|\alpha)$ works as the prior distribution, in the Bayesian framework, for the local parameter θ_i, $\pi(\theta_i|\alpha, [x_i]) \propto f^{\star}_{[X]}(\underline{x}_i, \overline{x}_i|\theta_i, m_i)\pi(\theta_i|\alpha)$ is the posterior distribution of the parameter of the local density $f(x|\theta_i)$ underlying $[x_i]$. Similarly, the posterior predictive distribution of latent data points underlying $[x_i]$ is directly available as $\pi(x|\alpha, [x_i]) \propto \int f(x|\theta_i)\pi(\theta_i|\alpha, [x_i])\,\mathrm{d}\theta_i$.

3.4 An asymptotic property of the generative model

Although they are constructed quite distinctly, it is possible to directly relate the descriptive and generative models under specific circumstances. In particular for standard (descriptive) symbolic analysis techniques, when there is no prior knowledge on the distribution of data within an interval, this distribution is commonly assumed to be uniform $U(a,b)$ with $a \leq b$ (e.g. Le-Rademacher and Billard, 2011). Let $I(\underline{x},\overline{x}\colon a \leq \underline{x} \leq \overline{x} \leq b)$ be an indicator function of $\underline{x}$ and $\overline{x}$, which equals 1 when $a \leq \underline{x} \leq \overline{x} \leq b$, and 0 elsewhere. Defining $f(x|\theta)$ so that $X_k \sim U(a,b)$ for $k = 1,\ldots,m$, and constructing $[X] = \varphi_{1,m}(X_{1:m})$ from the minimum and maximum values of these latent data points, then the density function of $[X]$ given by (7) becomes

$$f^{\star\star}_{[X]}(\underline{x},\overline{x}|a,b,m) = m(m-1)(\overline{x}-\underline{x})^{m-2}(b-a)^{-m} I(\underline{x},\overline{x}\colon a \leq \underline{x} \leq \overline{x} \leq b),$$

which converges to a point mass at $[a,b]$ as $m \to \infty$ (Section 3.2). Then, by substituting $f^{\star\star}_{[X]}(\underline{x},\overline{x}|a,b,m)$ into (9), the hierarchical generative model becomes

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x},\overline{x}|m) = \iint_{\{a\leq\underline{x},b\geq\overline{x}\}} m(m-1)\frac{(\overline{x}-\underline{x})^{m-2}}{(b-a)^m}\pi(a,b)\,\mathrm{d}a\mathrm{d}b. \tag{10}$$

where $\pi(\theta|\alpha) = \pi(a,b)$ describes the inter-interval parameter variability. When m is large, the following theorem states that this hierarchical generative model converges to $\pi(\underline{x},\overline{x})$, which is a valid descriptive model.

Theorem 6. *Suppose that $[X] = \varphi_{1,m}(X_{1:m})$ with $X_k \sim U(a,b)$ for $k = 1,\ldots,m$, and the global density function $\pi(a,b)$ is bounded, continuous and equal to 0 when $a > b$. Then as $m \to \infty$, the density function of $[X]$ (10) converges to $\pi(\underline{x},\overline{x})$ pointwise, i.e.*

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} f_{[X]}(\underline{x},\overline{x}|m) = \pi(\underline{x},\overline{x}).$$

(Proof in Appendix B.6)

This result is interesting in that it reveals that descriptive models for $[X] \sim f_{[X]}(\underline{x},\overline{x}|\theta)$ described in Section 3.1 (e.g. Arroyo et al., 2010; Le-Rademacher and Billard, 2011; Brito and Duarte Silva, 2012) actually possess an underlying and implicit generative structure. Specifically, the sampling process of the descriptive model $[X] \sim f_{[X]}(\underline{x},\overline{x}) = \pi(\underline{x},\overline{x})$ can be expressed via the generative process

$$\begin{aligned} [X] &= \lim_{m\to\infty} \varphi_{1,m}(X_{1:m}), \\ X_1, X_2 \ldots &\sim U(\underline{X}_\star, \overline{X}_\star), \\ (\underline{X}_\star, \overline{X}_\star) &\sim \pi(\underline{x},\overline{x}), \end{aligned}$$

That is, to obtain a sample realisation of $[X]$, values of lower and upper bound parameters, $(\underline{X}_\star, \overline{X}_\star)$, of local uniform distribution are first drawn from the descriptive model $\pi(\underline{x},\overline{x})$, which in this case is exactly equivalent to the global density for the associated underlying hierarchical generative model. As the resulting infinite collection of latent data

points $X_1, X_2, \ldots \sim U(\underline{X}_\star, \overline{X}_\star)$ fully identifies the local density, and $\min_k\{X_k\} = \underline{X}_\star$ and $\max_k\{X_k\} = \overline{X}_\star$ are sufficient statistics for uniform distributions, the generated interval $[X]$ is then determined as $[X] = [\underline{X}_\star, \overline{X}_\star]$ with $(\underline{X}_\star, \overline{X}_\star) \sim \pi(\underline{x}_\star, \overline{x}_\star)$. As a result, there is no loss of information from the data aggregation procedure and the variation of $[X]$ is completely due to the variation permitted in the distribution of local parameters, which is the global distribution. In this manner, the descriptive model is a special case of and directly interpretable as a particular generative model.

This idea can be extended to a more general class of hierarchical generative models in which the local distribution is only governed by location (μ) and scale ($\tau > 0$) parameters, so that $X_k \sim f(x|\mu, \tau)$ for $k = 1, \ldots, m$. Suppose $\underline{x}$ and $\overline{x}$ are the l-th and u-th order statistics, respectively. The associated values of μ and τ are available by solving

$$\begin{cases} Q(l/(m+1); \mu, \tau) & = \underline{x} \\ Q(u/(m+1); \mu, \tau) & = \overline{x} \end{cases}, \tag{11}$$

where $Q(\cdot; \mu, \tau)$ is the quantile function of $f(x|\mu, \tau)$. If a unique solution exists for (11), then $f(x|\mu, \tau)$ is an *interval-identifiable* local distribution.

We previously discussed that under the order statistic based data aggregation function, the i.i.d. generative model (6) will converge to a point mass as $m \to \infty$. Similar to Theorem 6, those hierarchical generative models (9) with interval-identifiable local density functions $f(x|\mu, \tau)$ will also converge to descriptive models.

Theorem 7. *Suppose that $[X] = \varphi_{l,u}(X_{1:m})$ with $X_k \sim f(x|\mu, \tau)$ for $k = 1, \ldots, m$, where the local density function $f(x|\mu, \tau)$ is interval-identifiable with location parameter μ and scale parameter $\tau > 0$. Further suppose that $l/(m+1) \to \underline{p} > 0$ and $u/(m+1) \to \overline{p} < 1$ as $m \to \infty$, and*

i) the global density function $\pi(\mu, \tau)$ is twice differentiable;

ii) $f(x|\mu, \tau)$ is positive and continuous in neighbourhoods of $Q(\underline{p}; \mu, \tau)$ and $Q(\overline{p}; \mu, \tau)$;

iii) $\iint |f^\star_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\mu, \tau, m, l, u)| \pi(\mu, \tau)\, \mathrm{d}\mu \mathrm{d}\tau < \infty$ for any $0 < l < u < m$.

Then as $m \to \infty$, the density function of $[X]$ for the hierarchical generative model (9) converges pointwise to

$$\pi_\star(\underline{x}, \overline{x}) = \pi\left(\mu(\underline{x}, \overline{x}; \underline{p}, \overline{p}), \tau(\underline{x}, \overline{x}; \underline{p}, \overline{p})\right) \times \left|J(\mu(\underline{x}, \overline{x}; \underline{p}, \overline{p}), \tau(\underline{x}, \overline{x}; \underline{p}, \overline{p}); \underline{p}, \overline{p})\right|^{-1},$$

where $\mu(\underline{x}, \overline{x}; \underline{p}, \overline{p})$ and $\tau(\underline{x}, \overline{x}; \underline{p}, \overline{p})$ are the solution of (11) and

$$J(\mu, \tau; \underline{p}, \overline{p}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} Q(\underline{p}|\mu, \tau) & \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Q(\underline{p}|\mu, \tau) \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} Q(\overline{p}|\mu, \tau) & \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Q(\overline{p}|\mu, \tau) \end{pmatrix}.$$

(Proof in Appendix B.7)

In the specific case where $f(x|a,b)$ is a $U[a,b]$ local density function, with quantile function $Q(p|a,b) = (1-p)a + pb$, the hierarchical generative model (9) converges to the distribution of

$$[(1-\underline{p})\underline{X}_\star + \underline{p}\overline{X}_\star, (1-\overline{p})\underline{X}_\star + \overline{p}\overline{X}_\star],$$

where $(\underline{X}_\star, \overline{X}_\star) \sim \pi(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$.

4 Multivariate Models for Hypercubes

The p-dimensional equivalent of the univariate interval-valued random variable $[X]$ is the random p-hypercube, which corresponds to a p-tuple of random intervals. In specific, we denote $[\boldsymbol{x}] = ([x_1], \ldots, [x_p]) \in \mathbb{I}^p$ as a hypercube in the space of p-hypercubes, and $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ as one p-dimensional latent data point. It is straightforward to extend the previous theory on distributions and likelihood functions for random intervals (Sections 2 and 3) to random hypercubes.

4.1 Distribution and density functions

Let $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}^p}$ be the metric topology induce by the Hausdorff metric on $\mathbb{I}^p$. Due to the isometry, $h_p([\boldsymbol{x}]) = (\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \ldots, \underline{x}_p, \overline{x}_p)$, between $\mathbb{I}^p$ and $\mathbb{R}^{2p}$, $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}^p}$ is also the product topology induced by $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$. Accordingly, the product topology on $\mathbb{I}^p$ leads to the Borel σ-algebra $\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}^p} = \sigma(\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}^p})$ which is the smallest σ-algebra generated by the collection of all $\{[\mathbf{x}'] \subseteq [\mathbf{x}]\}$. Suppose that $\mathrm{d}[\boldsymbol{x}] = (\mathrm{d}[x_1], \ldots, \mathrm{d}[x_p])$ is the infinitesimal neighbourhood of $[\boldsymbol{x}]$. On the measurable space $(\mathbb{I}^p, \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}^p})$, the uniform product measure can be defined as

$$\mu_{\mathbb{I}^p}(\mathrm{d}[\boldsymbol{x}]) = \prod_{j=1}^{p} \mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathrm{d}[x_j]),$$

which is the product of the uniform measure on $\mathbb{I}$. The existence and uniqueness of $\mu_{\mathbb{I}^p}$ is then guaranteed by Fubini's theorem (Durrett, 2010). (See Appendix A.3 for more details)

The containment distribution function of $[\boldsymbol{X}]$, denoted $F_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}\colon \mathbb{R}^{2p} \mapsto [0,1]$, is a function on the real hyperplane, having similar properties to those described in Definition 1 (not stated here for clarity). The following theorems define the density function for $[\boldsymbol{X}]$.

Theorem 8. *Let $F_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}\colon \mathbb{R}^{2\mathrm{p}} \mapsto [0,1]$ be the containment distribution function of a random hypercube $[\boldsymbol{X}]$. If $F_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}$ is $2p$-times differentiable, then the density function of $[\boldsymbol{X}]$ is*

$$f_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \ldots, \underline{x}_p, \overline{x}_p) = (-1)^p \frac{\partial^{2p}}{\partial \underline{x}_1 \partial \overline{x}_1 \ldots \partial \underline{x}_p \partial \overline{x}_p} F_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \ldots, \underline{x}_p, \overline{x}_p). \tag{12}$$

(Proof in Appendix B.8)

Theorem 9. *A non-negative function $f_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}\colon \mathbb{R}^{2p} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is the density function of a random p-hypercube $[\boldsymbol{X}]$, with the containment distribution function*

$$F_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \ldots, \underline{x}_p, \overline{x}_p) = \int_{\underline{x}_p}^{\overline{x}_p} \cdots \int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\overline{x}_1} f_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}(\underline{x}'_1, \overline{x}'_1, \ldots, \underline{x}'_p, \overline{x}'_p)\, \mathrm{d}\underline{x}'_1 \mathrm{d}\overline{x}'_1 \ldots \mathrm{d}\underline{x}'_p \mathrm{d}\overline{x}'_p$$

if and only if it satisfies

1. $f_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \ldots, \underline{x}_p, \overline{x}_p) = 0$ *when* $\underline{x}_j > \overline{x}_j$ *for at least one* j*;*
2. $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \ldots, \underline{x}_p, \overline{x}_p)\, \mathrm{d}\underline{x}_1 \mathrm{d}\overline{x}_1 \ldots \mathrm{d}\underline{x}_p \mathrm{d}\overline{x}_p = 1.$

(Proof in Appendix B.8)

Note that $f_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \ldots, \underline{x}_p, \overline{x}_p)$ is the joint density function of $2p$-dimensional real-valued random variables with constraints. Similar to the random-interval case, this suggests that a random p-hypercube can be equivalently modelled by a $2p$-dimensional real-valued random vector with the constraints $\underline{x}_j \leq \overline{x}_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, p$.

4.2 Likelihood functions and models

From Theorem 9, descriptive models for random p-hypercubes may be constructed through direct specification of the $2p$-dimensional density function $f_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \ldots, \underline{x}_p, \overline{x}_p)$. These models are easily constructed and simple to use, but have the same limitations as the descriptive models for random intervals discussed in Section 3.1.

Containment distribution functions and likelihood functions of generative models may be formulated using the same ideas as in (3) and (4). However, due to the necessity of calculating $2p$-th order mixed derivatives in (12), although intuitive, the structure of the resulting likelihood functions would be highly complex, even for i.i.d. generative models of random rectangles. The form of the likelihood function for an i.i.d. generative model in the bivariate case $[\boldsymbol{X}] = [X_1] \times [X_2]$ is presented in Appendix B.9.

The complex form of the likelihood function of an i.i.d. generative model accordingly induces a similarly complex hierarchical generative model. One option to produce more tractable models is to impose a conditional independent structure within each p-dimensional latent data point, so that $\boldsymbol{x}_k \sim f(\boldsymbol{x}|\theta_{1:p}) = \prod_{j=1}^{p} f(x_j|\theta_j)$. Consequently, each random interval marginal distribution of the p-hypercube is conditionally independent of the others, i.e. $f^{\star}_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \ldots, \underline{x}_p, \overline{x}_p|\theta_{1:p}) = \prod_{j=1}^{p} f^{\star}_{[X_j]}(\underline{x}_j, \overline{x}_j|\theta_j)$, where $f^{\star}_{[X_j]}(\underline{x}_j, \overline{x}_j|\theta_j)$ is the likelihood function of the i.i.d. generative model (5) for $[X_j]$. Although this choice will result in clear modelling consequences, the resulting likelihood function for the hierarchical generative model

$$f_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \ldots, \underline{x}_p, \overline{x}_p|m, \alpha) = \int \prod_{j=1}^{p} f^{\star}_{[X_j]}(\underline{x}_j, \overline{x}_j|\theta_j)\pi(\theta_{1:p}|\alpha)\, \mathrm{d}\theta_{1:p} \tag{13}$$

will only then require p second-order mixed derivatives.

In this scenario, dependencies between the random interval marginal distributions of $[\boldsymbol{X}]$, such as temporal or spatial dependencies, are controlled only by the dependence among local parameters $\theta_{1:p}$ as introduced by the global distribution $\pi(\theta_{1:p}|\alpha)$. As a result, beyond any *a priori* information on the joint distribution of the p-dimensional latent data points underlying construction of the random interval $[\boldsymbol{X}]$ being incorporated within $\pi(\theta_{1:p}|\alpha)$, it will be impossible to identify any further dependence based on the observed p-hypercubes. If this is inadequate for a given analysis, the full multivariate likelihood will need to be derived (e.g. Appendix B.9).

5 Applications

We illustrate our proposed approaches by firstly comparing the performance of the generative models to the existing descriptive models for simulated univariate (random interval) data. We then provide a generative model reanalysis of a real dataset of 5,000 credit card customers, as previously analysed by Brito and Duarte Silva (2012) using a descriptive model.

5.1 Simulated data analysis

In order to provide a direct comparison between descriptive and generative models, we construct our observed random intervals under the generative model as $[x_i] = [\underline{x}_i, \overline{x}_i]$, where $\underline{x}_i$ and $\overline{x}_i$ are respectively the observed minimum and maximum values of $x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{im_i}$ under the mixture model

$$\begin{aligned} x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{im_i} &\sim U(c_i - \mathrm{e}^{\tau_i}, c_i + \mathrm{e}^{\tau_i}), \\ c_i \sim N(\mu_c, \sigma_c^2) \quad &\text{and} \quad \tau_i \sim N(\mu_\tau, \sigma_\tau^2), \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. From Theorem 6, this hierarchical model is asymptotically equivalent (as $m_i \to \infty$ for each i) to a descriptive model with $[x_i^\star] = [c_i^\star - \mathrm{e}^{\tau_i^\star}, c_i^\star + \mathrm{e}^{\tau_i^\star}]$, where $(c_i^\star, \tau_i^\star)$ follows the same joint distribution as (c_i, τ_i). While in practice random intervals will generally be constructed from different numbers of random samples, $x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{im_i}$ (e.g. see Section 5.2), here we specify $m_i = m$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. In this analysis we will compare the maximum likelihood estimators (MLEs) of parameters for both generative and descriptive models obtained using data simulated from each model.

For each random interval $[x_i]$ under the mixture model, the two-dimensional integration (9), with $\theta = (c_i, \tau_i)$, can be reduced to a one-dimensional integration by first integrating out c_i, and then reparameterising to $z_i = m(\tau_i - \log \frac{1}{2}(\overline{x}_i - \underline{x}_i))$. This leads to the likelihood function of a single interval observation $[x_i]$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty (\overline{x}_i - \underline{x}_i)^{-2}(m-1)\mathrm{e}^{-z_i}\phi(m^{-1}z_i + \log\frac{\overline{x}_i - \underline{x}_i}{2}; \mu_\tau, \sigma_\tau^2) \times \\ \{\Phi(\underline{x}_i + \frac{\overline{x}_i - \underline{x}_i}{2}\mathrm{e}^{m^{-1}z_i}; \mu_c, \sigma_c^2) - \Phi(\overline{x}_i - \frac{\overline{x}_i - \underline{x}_i}{2}\mathrm{e}^{m^{-1}z_i}; \mu_c, \sigma_c^2)\}\,\mathrm{d}z_i, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$



Figure 1: (a) Forms of the integrand in (15), with $m = 2, 5, 10, 25, 50, 100$, as a function of z_i, and (b) the negative log likelihood function as a function of m, when $\underline{x}_i = -1$, $\overline{x}_i = 1$, $\mu_c = \mu_\tau = 0$ and $\sigma_c^2 = \sigma_\tau^2 = 1$.

where ϕ and Φ respectively denote the Gaussian density and distribution function. This form may be quickly and accurately approximated by Gauss-Laguerre quadrature methods (e.g. Evans and Swartz, 2000). The form of the integrand in (15) for varying m and the resulting negative log-likelihood function is shown in Figure 1 for $\underline{x}_i = -1$, $\overline{x}_i = 1$, $\mu_c = \mu_\tau = 0$ and $\sigma_c^2 = \sigma_\tau^2 = 1$. These plots illustrate the convergence of the generative model to the descriptive model as m gets large (Theorem 6), with only very minor differences observed for $m > 30$, and also suggest (panel (a)) that quadrature integration methods will be accurate with around 20 nodes.

We simulate 1,000 replicate datasets, each comprising $n = 100$ intervals, from the descriptive model with $c_i^\star, \tau_i^\star \sim N(0, 1)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ (i.e. $\mu_c = \mu_\tau = 0$ and $\sigma_c^2 = \sigma_\tau^2 = 1$). MLEs of the model parameters $(\mu_c, \mu_\tau, \sigma_c^2, \sigma_\tau^2)$ are obtained from fitting both descriptive and generative models, with the latter assuming a specified number of latent variables, m. Note that in practice, the number of latent variables, m, will typically be known (and finite). The first column of Figure 2 illustrates the differences between the resulting descriptive and generative model parameter MLEs (e.g. $\hat{\mu}_c^{(D)} - \hat{\mu}_c^{(G)}$, where the superscripts indicate parameters of the descriptive (D) and generative (G) models), with the solid line indicating the mean and the dotted lines the central 95% interval, computed over the 1,000 replicates.

Firstly, we notice that the difference between the estimates is large for small m, and becomes gradually smaller as m increases. This is not surprising as in this model specification, the generative model approaches the descriptive mode as $m \to \infty$. However, as both models are identically centred, the mean difference between the location parameter



Figure 2: Differences between MLEs of the descriptive model and the generative hierarchical model, based on data generated from each model (left column = descriptive model data, right column = generative model data), as a function of $m = 5, \ldots, 100$, the number of latent data points $x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{im}$ in the generative model. Lines indicate the MLE means (solid lines) and 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles (dashed lines) based on 1,000 replicate datasets.

estimates $\hat{\mu}_c^{(D)}$ and $\hat{\mu}_c^{(G)}$ is zero, regardless of the number of latent variables.

An obvious area of difference is that the point estimates of the interval half-range (modelled by μ_τ) are much smaller for the (correct) descriptive model than for the generative model. This occurs as, the expected range of $x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{im}$ under a generative model is lower for small m than it is for large m. As a result, the generative model will determine that μ_τ should be sufficiently larger for small m than it would be for large m, given the same observed $[\underline{x}_i, \overline{x}_i]$. That is, if the data are truly generated from the descriptive model, parameters estimated from the generative model are effectively biased for any finite m, and overestimate the true model parameters, with the magnitude of the bias determined by the assumed value of m. Of course, this bias can be reduced by setting m to be large in this case.

The second area of difference is that the estimated variability of the point estimates of interval location and scale ($\hat{\sigma}_c^2$ and $\hat{\sigma}_\tau^2$) is higher under the descriptive model than under the generative model. This occurs as the generative model assumes that the variability of e.g. $\frac{\underline{x}_i + \overline{x}_i}{2}$ comprises both the variability of the latent data $x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{im}$ within interval i, in addition to the variability of interval locations c_i between intervals. Under the descriptive model, this first source of variability is zero, and therefore $\hat{\sigma}_c^{2(D)}$ will always be greater than $\hat{\sigma}_c^{2(G)}$ for finite m. Similar reasoning explains why $\hat{\sigma}_\tau^{2(D)}$ is always greater than $\hat{\sigma}_\tau^{2(G)}$.

The second column of Figure 2 shows the same output as the first column, but based on data simulated from the generative model with the same parameter settings as before, and for varying (true) numbers of latent data points $m = 5, \ldots, 100$. The results are similar to before, except critically with the interpretation that the generative model with fixed m is now correct. This means that, for example, if intervals are constructed using the generative process (which is the most likely scenario in practice) but are then analysed with a descriptive model, the point estimates of interval range (μ_τ) can be substantially underestimated by assuming $m \to \infty$ under the descriptive model, when in fact m is small and finite. Similarly, the estimates of σ_c^2 and σ_τ^2 will always be overestimated when assuming an incorrect descriptive model. These scenarios will obviously be problematic for data analysis in practice.

The takeaway message of this analysis is that it is important to fit the model (descriptive or generative) that matches the interval (or p-hypercube) construction process. Failure to do so can result in misinterpretation of model parameters, resulting in severe biases in parameter estimates, which can then detrimentally impact on an analysis. In practice, intervals tend to be constructed from underlying classical data (e.g. see Section 5.2), using a known process and where m is also known. This implies that the generative model is a more natural construction than the descriptive model, and with parameters that more directly relate to the observed data.

While this analysis has assumed uniformity of the generative process (14) in order that the descriptive model is obtained as $m \to \infty$, and hence that the parameter estimates between the two models can be directly compared, the same principles of interpretation and bias occur regardless of the generative model. The parameters are simply less directly comparable with each other.



Figure 3: Log income and log credit card debt in thousands of US$ for $5,000$ customers. Panels illustrate rectangle-valued observations constructed from three groups of customers comprising (a) $m_{i_a} = 5$, (b) $m_{i_b} = 28$ and (c) $m_{i_c} = 56$ individuals. The contours in the last three panels indicate the predictive distributions of individuals for each group conditional on the corresponding rectangle-valued observations, based on the generative model.

5.2 Analysis of credit card data

The data (available in the SPSS package *customer.dbase*) comprise log income and log credit card debt in thousands of US$ of 5,000 credit card customers. In a previous analysis using descriptive models by Brito and Duarte Silva (2012), these data were aggregated into random bivariate rectangles by stratifying individuals according to gender, age category (18-24, 25-34, 35-49, 50-64, 65+ years old), level of education (did not complete high school, high-school degree, some college, college degree, undergraduate degree+), and designation of primary credit card (none, gold, platinum, other). This leads to 192 non-empty groups, each producing a random rectangle $[x_{i1}] \times [x_{i2}]$ constructed by the intervals bounded by the minimum and maximum observed values on log income and log credit card debt.

The data are illustrated in Figure 3, along with the underlying data and constructed

random rectangles for three of the 192 groups, containing (a) $m_{i_a} = 5$, (b) $m_{i_b} = 28$ and (c) m_{i_c}=56 individuals. The number of individuals in all groups varies greatly (from 5 to 56), and it is noticeable that the distribution of individuals within each group comes from a non-uniform distribution. As a result, the usual uniformity assumption of descriptive models for random rectangles is clearly inappropriate. The generative model is more suited to dealing with these heterogeneous rectangle-valued data containing complex intra-rectangle structures.

Given the clear non-uniformity within each group i, we assume that the underlying data are Gaussian with group-specific means and covariances. That is

$$(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) \sim N_2(\mu_i, \Sigma_i)$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, n = 192$, where $\mu_i = (\mu_{i1}, \mu_{i2})$ and $\Sigma_i = \text{diag}(\sigma^2_{i1}, \sigma^2_{i2})$. Note that we choose to model log income and log credit card debt as uncorrelated, despite there being some visual evidence of positive correlation in the data underlying each random rectangle. It is worth briefly explaining this decision in detail. For a small number of latent data points m_i, it is possible for a single point to determine both upper (or lower) ranges of the random rectangle, and the probability of this occurring increases as the correlation of the underlying data increases. So in principle, there is some information about the correlation structure of the underlying data available through the associated random rectangle. However, for groups with larger m_i, the upper and lower ranges of the random rectangles are more likely to be determined by four individual data points, in which case it is not then possible to discern the underlying correlation structure. Although we have several groups with small numbers of latent data points (e.g. $m_{i_a} = 5$), in principle allowing their correlation to be estimated, note that the same random rectangles will arise whether the latent data are positively or negatively correlated. That is, the correlation parameter is non-identifiable from the observed rectangle data. As such, we proceed without attempting to estimate this parameter, despite information on the magnitude of the correlation being available in principle for some groups.

We model the group-specific (local) parameters as

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu_{i1}, \mu_{i2}) &\sim N_2(\theta_1, \theta_2, \lambda_1^2, \lambda_2^2, \rho_\mu) \\ \log \sigma^2_{ij} &\sim N(\eta_j, \epsilon_j^2) \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

for $j = 1, 2$ and $i = 1, \ldots, 192$. The integration in the generative model (13) is achieved using Gauss-Hermite quadratures with 20^4 nodes to integrate over the four parameters.

Maximum likelihood estimates and 95% confidence intervals for each model parameter are illustrated in Table 1 for both generative and descriptive models. Similar to the results for the simulated examples, the point estimates of location (θ_1 and θ_2) are broadly insensitive to the choice of model, however the estimated values for many of other parameters differ between the two models. Most importantly, the estimated values of ρ_μ are considerably larger for the generative model ($\hat{\rho}_\mu = 0.9040$) compared to the descriptive model ($\hat{\rho}_\mu = 0.5695$). While both of these indicate a positive relationship between income and credit card debt, which is evident in the underlying data in

		θ_1	λ_1^2	θ_2	λ_2^2	ρ_μ	η_1	ϵ_1^2	η_2	ϵ_2^2
Generative	MLE	3.76	0.13	-0.36	0.21	0.90	-1.20	0.48	0.41	0.09
	95% CI	3.70	0.10	-0.44	0.13	0.83	-1.31	0.35	0.34	0.04
		3.82	0.17	-0.26	0.29	0.98	-1.09	0.61	0.48	0.13
Descriptive	MLE	3.79	0.17	-0.42	0.52	0.57	0.02	0.20	0.82	0.09
	95% CI	3.74	0.13	-0.53	0.41	0.47	-0.04	0.16	0.78	0.07
		3.85	0.20	-0.32	0.62	0.67	0.08	0.24	0.87	0.11

Table 1: Maximum likelihood estimates and 95% asymptotic confidence intervals for the parameters of the generative and descriptive models for the credit card dataset.

Figure 3, there is a clear difference in the strength of that relationship. The descriptive model results in a weaker estimated value in the correlation because it does not take the noisy data generating process into account. While we suspect that the generative model may be the more accurate of the two given the generative procedure used to construct the random rectangles, in terms of drawing inferential conclusions about the underlying data, it is critical that we are certain in this regard.

For the generative models, the distribution of the local parameters $(\mu_{ij}, \sigma_{ij}^2)$ for each rectangle-valued observation can be computed by empirical Bayesian methods (previously these parameters were integrated out for the optimisation in Table 1). The prior distribution for the local parameters is the global distribution (16) with its parameter values given by the estimates in Table 1, and the likelihood function is the local density function of one observed rectangle. The resulting marginal posterior distributions for the parameters of the observed rectangles (a)–(c) (Figure 3) are shown in Figure 4. Compared to the prior (solid line) the parameters are well informed, even for rectangle (a) with $m_{i_a} = 5$ observations, with the level of precision increasing with the number of individuals within each rectangle.

Goodness-of-fit for both descriptive and generative models can be evaluated through model predictive distributions of random rectangles, in addition to predictive distributions for individual data points for the generative model. In the latter case, based on the posterior distributions of the local parameters in Figure 4, the predictive distributions of individual data points within the random intervals (a)–(c), conditional on observing the associated random interval, are shown in Figure 3. While the predictive distributions are marginally independent due to the model specification, their coverage describes the observed data well. For group (a) the predictive distribution covers a wider region than the observed rectangle, as this rectangle is constructed from only 5 individuals. As the number of individuals increases in groups (b) and (c), the predictive regions more closely represent the region of the observed rectangle, indicating that the generative model has the ability to correctly account for the different numbers of individuals used to construct each rectangle. The predictive distribution for group (b) individuals also indicates some robustness to the two outliers that completely define the observed rectangle. This occurs as the model correctly accounts for the fact that rectangle (b) is constructed from half



Figure 4: Estimated marginal posterior distributions of the local parameters μ_{i1}, μ_{i2}, σ^2_{i1} and σ^2_{i2} associated with the three groups (a)–(c) shown in Figure 3. Solid lines correspond to the prior distributions for local parameters

the number of observations used to construct the rectangle of group (c), even though both rectangles are roughly the same size.

The predictive distributions of random rectangles for groups (a)–(c) are illustrated in Figure 5 for both descriptive (dashed lines) and generative (solid lines) models. Shown are the bivariate predictive distributions of interval centre and log half-range, for both log income (top row) and log debt (bottom row). The dot indicates the observed interval. Under the generative model, these distributions are obtained directly from the predictive distributions for individuals (Figure 3).

In all cases, the predictive distributions of the generative model more accurately, and more precisely identify the location of the observed data. This is particularly the case in group (a) in which the descriptive model is clearly indicating a lack of model fit. The predicted interval for log debt in group (b) is not fully centred on the observed interval, as the model attempts to account for the unlikely (under the model) construction of the observed interval by outliers (Figure 3). However, the observed data are still well


(a) m_a = 5: Log income
(b) m_b = 28: Log income
(c) m_c = 56: Log income
Log half-range: log(y_1r)
Interval centre: y_1c
(a) m_a = 5: Log debt
(b) m_b = 28: Log debt
(c) m_c = 56: Log debt
Log half-range: log(y_2r)
Interval centre: y_2c

Figure 5: Posterior predictive distribution of a random rectangle $[y_1] \times [y_2]$ for each of the groups (a)–(c) (left column to right) in Figure 3. Columns illustrate the marginal random intervals of log income ($[y_1]$, top row) and log debt ($[y_2]$, bottom row) with each interval $[y_j] = [y_{j1}, y_{j2}]$ expressed in interval centre and half-range form $(y_{jc}, y_{jr}) = ((y_{j1} + y_{j2})/2, (y_{j2} - y_{j1})/2)$ for $j = 1, 2$. Solid and dashed lines indicate predictive distributions of generative and descriptive models, respectively. The dot indicates the observed interval $[x_{i1}] \times [x_{i2}]$ used for model fitting.

predicted under the generative model. The overall fit to the observed data is better under the generative model than the descriptive model, indicating that it more accurately describes the complexities of the observed data.

6 Discussion

Current techniques for modelling random intervals (and random p-hypercubes) are based on constructing models directly at the level of the interval-valued data (e.g. Arroyo et al., 2010; Le-Rademacher and Billard, 2011; Brito and Duarte Silva, 2012). These approaches are additionally based on the assumption that the unobserved individual data points from which the interval is constructed are uniformly distributed within the interval. As we have demonstrated in Section 5, using these descriptive methods when the data are constructed from an underlying individual data points, which is typical in practical applications, can result in misleading and biased parameter estimates and therefore unreliable inferences.

In this article we have established the distribution theory for interval-valued random

variables which are constructed bottom-up from distributions of latent real-valued data and aggregation functions used to construct the random intervals. These generative models explicitly permit the fitting of standard statistical models for latent data points through likelihood-based techniques, while accounting for the manner in which the observed interval-valued data are constructed. This approach directly accounts for the non-uniformity of latent individual data points within intervals, and provides a natural way to handle the differing number of latent data points m_i within each random interval, which is again typical in practice.

By deriving a descriptive model as the limiting case of a generative model (i.e. as $m_i \to \infty$ for each i), we have demonstrated that these descriptive models have an explicit underlying generative model interpretation. In turn this indicates why inferences from descriptive models may be potentially misleading in practice.

In order to evaluate the integrated generative likelihood function (13) for the unimodal distributions considered in Section 5, we have used Gaussian quadrature methods. This technique will be less useful when integrating over more than 6 parameters (Evans and Swartz, 1995), or when there are strong dependencies between local parameters. In these cases, approximate MLE's can be obtained using e.g. Monte Carlo maximum likelihood estimation (Geyer and Thompson, 1992) or Monte Carlo expectation maximization techniques (Wei and Tanner, 1990), or in the Bayesian framework Gibbs sampling (Geman and Geman, 1984) or pseudo-marginal Monte Carlo methods (Andrieu and Roberts, 2009).

In order to construct the likelihood function (13) for p-hypercubes we assumed independence among all margins in local distributions to avoid the $2p$-th order mixed-differentiation of $F_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \ldots, \underline{x}_p, \overline{x}_p)$. Although this differentiation may be achieved using symbolic computation software, the resulting likelihood functions are complex even when $p = 2$ (see Appendix B.9), and the alternative of numerical differentiation would be highly computational. However, this independence assumption does not hold if there is priori information on the dependence structure within each latent data point $\boldsymbol{x}$. As pointed out by Billard and Diday (2006), this is often the case because the structure of symbolic data might determine inherent dependencies such as logical, taxonomic and hierarchical dependencies, but not statistical dependencies. In the generative model, those dependencies as well as statistical dependencies can be addressed simultaneously through the local distribution function $f(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$. However, without the marginal independence assumption, inference for these models can be challenging.

Finally, while our examples have focused on minimum and maximum based data aggregation functions $\varphi(x_{1:m})$, there is clear interest in parameter estimation and inference for more robust order-based functions $\varphi_{l,u}(x_{1:m})$, as the resulting intervals will be less sensitive to outliers. The procedures for constructing the associated likelihood functions are analogous to those presented here, and Theorem 7 provides their limiting descriptive model counterpart. An additional practical question for inference using order-based aggregation functions is which order-based statistics to use. As this choice will impact on the efficiency of the resulting inference, it is an open question to understand what method of random interval construction would be optimal for any given analysis.

Acknowledgements

Xin Zhang is supported by the China Scholarship Council. Scott A. Sisson is supported by the Australian Research Council (CE140100049).

References

Aldous, D. J. (1985). Exchangeability and related topics. In *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIII — 1983*, Volume 1117, pp. 1–198. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Andrieu, C. and G. O. Roberts (2009, 04). The pseudo-marginal approach for efficient Monte Carlo computations. *The Annals of Statistics 37*(2), 697–725.

Arroyo, J., R. Espínola, and C. Maté (2010). Different approaches to forecast interval time series: A comparison in finance. *Computational Economics 37*(2), 169–191.

Beresteanu, A., I. Molchanov, and F. Molinari (2012). Partial identification using random set theory. *Journal of Econometrics 166*(1), 17–32.

Beresteanu, A. and F. Molinari (2008). Asymptotic properties for a class of partially identified models. *Econometrica 76*(4), 763–814.

Billard, L. (2007). Dependencies and variation components of symbolic interval-valued data. In *Selected Contributions in Data Analysis and Classification*, pp. 3–12. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Billard, L. and E. Diday (2003). From the statistics of data to the statistics of knowledge: Symbolic data analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 98*(462), 470–487.

Billard, L. and E. Diday (2006). *Symbolic data analysis: Conceptual statistics and data mining*. John Wiley & Sons.

Brito, P. and A. Duarte Silva (2012). Modelling interval data with Normal and Skew-Normal distributions. *Journal of Applied Statistics 39*(1), 3–20.

Diday, E. (1987). Introduction a e'approche symbolique en analyse des donnees. *Premiere Journées Symbolique-Numerique CEREMADE, Universite Paris - Dauphine*, 21–56.

Domingues, M. A. O., R. M. C. R. de Souza, and F. J. A. Cysneiros (2010). A robust method for linear regression of symbolic interval data. *Pattern Recognition Letters 31*, 1991–1996.

Durrett, R. (2010). *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Cambridge University Press.

Evans, M. and T. Swartz (1995, 08). Methods for approximating integrals in Statistics with special emphasis on Bayesian integration problems. *Statistical Science 10*(3), 254–272.

Evans, M. and T. Swartz (2000). *Approximating integrals via Monte Carlo and deterministic methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fisher, R., R. A. O'Leary, S. Low-Choy, K. Mengersen, N. Knowlton, and R. E. B. amd M. J. Caley (2015). Species richness on coral reefs and the pursuit of convergent global estimates. *Current Biology 25*, 500–505.

Geman, S. and D. Geman (1984, Nov). Stochastic relaxation, Gibbs distributions, and the Bayesian restoration of images. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on 6*(6), 721–741.

Geyer, C. J. and E. A. Thompson (1992). Constrained Monte Carlo maximum likelihood for dependent data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological) 54*(3), 657–699.

Le-Rademacher, J. and L. Billard (2011). Likelihood functions and some maximum likelihood estimators for symbolic data. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference 141*(4), 1593–1602.

Lyashenko, N. (1983). Statistics of random compacts in Euclidean space. *Journal of Soviet Mathematics 21*(1), 76–92.

Matheron, G. (1975). *Random sets and integral geometry*. Wiley.

McLachlan, G. J. and P. N. Jones (1988). Fitting mixture models to grouped and truncated data via the EM algorithm. *Biometrics 44*, 571–578.

Molchanov, I. (2005). *Theory of random sets*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Molchanov, I. and F. Molinari (2014). Applications of random set theory in Econometrics. *Annual Review of Economics 6*(1), 229–251.

Moore, R. (1966). *Interval analysis*, Volume 22. Prentice-Hall.

Munkres, J. R. (2000). *Topology*. Prentice Hall, Incorporated.

Neto, E. A. L. and F. A. T. Carvalho (2010). Constrained linear regression models for symbolic interval-valued variables. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis 54*, 333–347.

Noirhomme-Fraiture, M. and P. Brito (2011). Far beyond the classical data models: Symbolic data analysis. *Statistical Analysis and Data Mining 4*(2), 157–170.

Reiss, R.-D. (1989). Approximate distributions of order statistics.

Sun, Y. and D. Ralescu (2014). A normal hierarchical model and minimum contrast estimation for random intervals. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 1–21.

Vardeman, S. B. and C.-S. Lee (2005). Likelihood-based statistical estimation from quantised data. *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement 54*, 409–414.

Wei, G. C. G. and M. A. Tanner (1990). A Monte Carlo implementation of the EM algorithm and the poor man's data augmentation algorithms. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 85*(411), 699–704.

Xu, W. (2010). *Symbolic data analysis: Interval-valued data regression.* Ph. D. thesis, University of Georgia, USA.

A Topology

A.1 The basis

The basis of the standard topology on $\mathbb{R}^2$ is the collection of all open rectangles. Its subspace topology induced by $\{(x, y)\colon x \leq y\}$, as shown in Figure 6, has the basis of which each element is the remaining part of a open rectangle on the top-left half plane. Therefore, the collection of their counterparts on $\mathbb{I}$ via the isometry, $h([x]) = (\underline{x}, \overline{x})$, is the basis of $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$.

The open subset of $\mathbb{I}$ corresponding to the rectangle (a) in Figure 6 is

$$B([a],[b]) \quad = \quad \{[x]\colon \underline{b} < \underline{x} < \underline{a} \leq \overline{a} < \overline{x} < \overline{b}\}.$$

This is the collection of all intervals for which the lower bounds are bounded between $\underline{a}$ and $\underline{b}$, while the upper bounds are bounded between $\overline{a}$ and $\overline{b}$. The open subset of $\mathbb{I}$ corresponding to the triangle (b) is

$$W([c]) = \{[x]\colon \underline{c} < \underline{x} \leq \overline{x} < \overline{c}\}.$$

This is the collection of all intervals for which the lower bounds are greater than $\underline{c}$, while the upper bounds are smaller than $\overline{c}$.

Lemma 1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{E}$ is the collection of all $B([a],[b])$ and $W([c])$. Then $\mathcal{E}$ is a basis for $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$.*

Proof. We first show that $\mathcal{E}$ is a basis for a topology. Note that for any $[x] \in \mathbb{I}$, there exists at least one $E \in \mathcal{E}$ s.t. $[x] \in E$. Then, we show in the following that for any $E_1, E_2 \in \mathcal{E}$, if $[x] \in E_1 \cap E_2$, then there exists $E_3 \in \mathcal{E}$ s.t. $[x] \in E_3$ and $E_3 \subset E_1 \cap E_2$. Note that $\vee$ and $\wedge$ take the maximum and the minimum of two operands, respectively.

i) Consider $[x] \in B([a],[b]) \cap B([a'],[b']) \neq \varnothing$. Then $\underline{b} \vee \underline{b}' < \underline{a} \wedge \underline{a}'$ and $\overline{a} \vee \overline{a}' < \overline{b} \wedge \overline{b}'$. From $[x] \in B([a],[b])$, we have that $\underline{b} < \underline{x} < \underline{a} \leq \overline{a} < \overline{x} < \overline{b}$. From $[x] \in B([a'],[b'])$, we have that $\underline{b}' < \underline{x} < \underline{a}' \leq \overline{a}' < \overline{x} < \overline{b}'$. Therefore, $\underline{b} \vee \underline{b}' < \underline{x} < \underline{a} \wedge \underline{a}'$ and $\overline{a} \vee \overline{a}' < \overline{x} < \overline{b} \wedge \overline{b}'$. There exists $[a''],[b''] \in \mathbb{I}$ s.t. $\underline{b} \vee \underline{b}' < \underline{b}'' < \underline{x} < \underline{a}'' < \underline{a} \wedge \underline{a}'$ and $\overline{a} \vee \overline{a}' < \overline{a}'' < \overline{x} < \overline{b}'' < \overline{b} \wedge \overline{b}'$. That is $[x] \in B([a''],[b'']) \text{ and } B([a''],[b'']) \subset B([a],[b]) \cap B([a'],[b'])$.



Figure 6: $B([a],[b])$ and $W\{[a,b]\}$ are (a) and (b), respectively. (a), (b) and (c) constitute the basis of $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$.

ii) Consider $[x] \in W([c_1]) \cap W([c_2]) \neq \varnothing$. Then $\underline{c}_1 \vee \underline{c}_2 < \overline{c}_1 \wedge \overline{c}_2$. From $[x] \in W([c_1])$, we have that $\underline{c}_1 < \underline{x} \leq \overline{x} < \overline{c}_1$. From $[x] \in W([c_2])$, we have that $\underline{c}_2 < \underline{x} \leq \overline{x} < \overline{c}_2$. Therefore, $\underline{c}_1 \vee \underline{c}_2 < \underline{x} \leq \overline{x} < \overline{c}_1 \wedge \overline{c}_2$. There exists $[c] \in \mathbb{I}$ s.t. $\underline{c}_1 \vee \underline{c}_2 < \underline{c} < \underline{x} \leq \overline{x} < \overline{c} < \overline{c}_1 \wedge \overline{c}_2$. That is $[x] \in W([c])$ and $W([c]) \subset W([c_1]) \cap W([c_2])$.

iii) Consider $[x] \in B([a],[b]) \cap W([c]) \neq \varnothing$. Then $\underline{c} < \underline{a}$ and $\overline{c} > \overline{a}$. From $[x] \in B([a],[b])$, we have that $\underline{b} < \underline{x} < \underline{a} \leq \overline{a} < \overline{x} < \overline{b}$. From $[x] \in W([c])$, we have that $\underline{c} < \underline{x} \leq \overline{x} < \overline{c}$. Therefore, $\underline{c} \vee \underline{b} < \underline{x} < \underline{a} \leq \overline{a} < \overline{x} < \overline{c} \wedge \overline{b}$. There exists $[a'],[b'] \in \mathbb{I}$ s.t. $\underline{c} \vee \underline{b} < \underline{b}' < \underline{x} < \underline{a}' < \underline{a}$ and $\overline{a} < \overline{a}' < \overline{x} < \overline{b}' < \overline{c} \wedge \overline{b}$. That is $[x] \in B([a'],[b'])$ and $B([a'],[b']) \subset B([a],[b]) \cap W([c])$.

That is, $\mathcal{E}$ is a basis for a topology. Next, we show $\mathcal{E}$ is a basis for $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$. Figure 6 shows that the basis of $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ consists of three types of subsets. As $B([a],[b])$ is an (a)-type subset and $W\{[c]\}$ is a (b)-type subset, the topology generated by $\mathcal{E}$ is coarser than $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$. On the other hand, for any $[x]$ in a (c)-type subset, we can find at least one (a)-type subset or (b)-type subset that contains that $[x]$ and subsets of that (c)-type subset. Therefore, the topology generated by $\mathcal{E}$ is finer than $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$. In conclusion, the topology generated by $\mathcal{E}$ is $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$. □

A.2 Properties of the topology

Lemma 2. $B([a],[b]) = W([b]) \setminus \big[\{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a},\overline{b}]\} \cup \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b},\overline{a}]\}\big]$.

Proof. For any $[x] \in B([a],[b])$, i.e. $\underline{b} < \underline{x} < \underline{a} \leq \overline{a} < \overline{x} < \overline{b}$, we have $[x] \in W([b])$. Also $[x] \nsubseteq [\underline{a},\overline{b}]$ and $[x] \nsubseteq [\underline{b},\overline{a}]$, i.e $[x] \notin \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a},\overline{b}]\} \cup \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b},\overline{a}]\}$. Therefore, $B([a],[b]) \subseteq W([b]) \setminus \big[\{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a},\overline{b}]\} \cup \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b},\overline{a}]\}\big]$.

On the other hand, for any $[x] \in W([b]) \setminus \big[\{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a},\overline{b}]\} \cup \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b},\overline{a}]\}\big]$, we have $[x] \in W([b])$, i.e. $\underline{b} < \underline{x} \leq \overline{x} < \overline{b}$. Also $[x] \nsubseteq [\underline{a},\overline{b}]$ and $[x] \nsubseteq [\underline{b},\overline{a}]$, i.e. $\underline{x} < \underline{a}$ and $\overline{x} > \overline{a}$. Hence $\underline{b} < \underline{x} < \underline{a}$ and $\overline{a} < \overline{x} < \overline{b}$, i.e. $[x] \in B([a],[b])$. Therefore, $W([b]) \setminus \big[\{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a},\overline{b}]\} \cup \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b},\overline{a}]\}\big] \subseteq B([a],[b])$.

In conclusion, $B([a],[b]) = W([b]) \setminus \big[\{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a},\overline{b}]\} \cup \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b},\overline{a}]\}\big]$. □

Lemma 3. *$\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ is the smallest topology containing all $W([c])$ and $\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}^{\mathsf{c}}$.*

Proof. $\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}$ is a closed subset, as it is the closure of $W\{[c]\}$. Accordingly its complement $\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}^{\mathsf{c}}$ is open, and thus $\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}^{\mathsf{c}} \in \mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$. From Lemma 2, $B([a],[b]) = W([b]) \cap \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a}, \overline{b}]\}^{\mathsf{c}} \cap \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b}, \overline{a}]\}^{\mathsf{c}}$. So every element in $\mathcal{E}$ can be generated by set operations over finite elements of $W\{[c]\}$ and $\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}^{\mathsf{c}}$. As $\mathcal{E}$ is a basis of $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$, every element in $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ can be generated by set operations over finite elements of $W\{[c]\}$ and $\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}^{\mathsf{c}}$. Therefore, $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ is the smallest topology containing $W([c])$ and $\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}^{\mathsf{c}}$. □

A.3 Hypercubes

Similarly, through the property of isometry, $h_p([\boldsymbol{x}]) = (\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \ldots, \underline{x}_p, \overline{x}_p)$, it can be shown that a basis of the topology $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}^p}$ is the collection of the following two classes of subsets:

$$\begin{aligned} B_p([\boldsymbol{a}],[\boldsymbol{b}]) &= \{[\boldsymbol{x}] \colon \underline{b}_j < \underline{x}_j < \underline{a}_j \leq \overline{a}_j < \overline{x}_j < \overline{b}_j,\ j = 1, \ldots, p\}, \\ W_p([\boldsymbol{c}]) &= \{[\boldsymbol{x}] \colon \underline{c}_j < \underline{x}_j \leq \overline{x}_j < \overline{c}_j,\ j = 1, \ldots, p\}. \end{aligned}$$

The next lemma shows an analogous result of Lemma 2.

Lemma 4. *$B_p([\boldsymbol{a}],[\boldsymbol{b}]) = W_p([\boldsymbol{b}]) \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{p} [\{[\boldsymbol{x}] \subseteq [\boldsymbol{a}_{j1}]\} \cup \{[\boldsymbol{x}] \subseteq [\boldsymbol{a}_{j2}]\}]$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} [\boldsymbol{a}_{j1}] &= \left([a_1], \ldots, [\underline{a}_j, \overline{b}_j], \ldots, [a_p]\right), \\ [\boldsymbol{a}_{j2}] &= \left([a_1], \ldots, [\underline{b}_j, \overline{a}_j], \ldots, [a_p]\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of Lemma (2). □

Based on the above lemma, the hypercube's version of Theorem 1 can be proved in a similar way.

B Proofs

B.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. As an isometric embedding to the standard topology of the real plane, the topology $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ is separable, and thus it has a countable basis. We define rational intervals $[q] \in \mathbb{I}$ where $\underline{q}, \overline{q}$ are rational numbers. Then, the collection of all rational intervals, $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{Q}}$, is dense in $\mathbb{I}$.

We first show that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a countable basis of $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be the collection of all $B([q_1],[q_2])$ and $W([q])$. As rational numbers are countable, $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is countable. It can be shown that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a basis of a topology and its generated topology is $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ in a similar way to Lemma 1. As a result, $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a countable basis of $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$.

Then we show that $\sigma(\mathcal{F}) = \sigma(\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Q}})$. For any $\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\} = W([x])^{\mathsf{c}}$ and $W([x]) \in \mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ can be generated by set operations over countable elements from $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}$, as $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a countable basis of $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$. So, $\sigma(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Q}})$. On the other hand, for any

$W([q]) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{Q}}$, we have $W([q]) = \cup_{n=k}^{\infty}\{[q'] \subseteq [\underline{q}+1/n, \overline{q}-1/n]\}$, where $\overline{q}-\underline{q} \geq 2/k$, and for any $B([q_1],[q_2]) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{Q}}$, we have $B([q_1],[q_2]) = W([q_2]) \setminus \left[\{[q] \subseteq [\underline{q_1}, \overline{q_2}]\} \cup \{[q] \subseteq [\underline{q_2}, \overline{q_1}]\}\right]$ (Lemma 2). So, $\sigma(\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{Q}}) \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{F})$.

That is, $\sigma(\mathcal{F}) = \sigma(\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{Q}}) = \sigma(\mathscr{T}_{\mathbb{I}})$. □

B.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. We let

$$B^{\star}([a],[b]) = \{[x] \colon \underline{b} < \underline{x} \leq \underline{a} \leq \overline{a} \leq \overline{x} < \overline{b}\}. \tag{17}$$

In a way analogous to Lemma 2, we have

$$B^{\star}([a],[b]) = W([b]) \setminus \left[W([\underline{a}, \overline{b}]) \cup W([\underline{b}, \overline{a}])\right]. \tag{18}$$

By the continuity of the measure,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(W([x])) &= \mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\overset{\infty}{\cup}\{[x]' \subseteq [\underline{x}+1/n, \overline{x}-1/n]\}) \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\{[x]' \subseteq [\underline{x}+1/n, \overline{x}-1/n]\}) \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{2}(\overline{x}-\underline{x}-2/n)^2 = \frac{1}{2}(\overline{x}-\underline{x})^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $W([\underline{a}, \overline{b}]) \cap W([\underline{b}, \overline{a}]) = W([a])$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(B^{\star}([a],[b])) &= \mu_{\mathbb{I}}(W([b])) - \mu_{\mathbb{I}}(W([\underline{a}, \overline{b}])) - \mu_{\mathbb{I}}(W([\underline{b}, \overline{a}])) + \mu_{\mathbb{I}}(W([a])) \\
&= (\underline{a}-\underline{b})(\overline{b}-\overline{a}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathrm{d}[x]) = \mu_{\mathbb{I}}\left(B^{\star}([x], [\underline{x}-\mathrm{d}\underline{x}, \overline{x}+\mathrm{d}\overline{x}])\right) = \mathrm{d}\underline{x} \times \mathrm{d}\overline{x}$. □

B.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. As $\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}} = \sigma(\mathcal{F})$ (Theorem 1), any $E \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$ can be generated by set operations over at most countable elements from $\mathcal{F}$. So, it's probability measure $P([X] \in E)$ will be available if $P([X] \subseteq [x])$ is known for any $[x]$. Therefore, the uniqueness has been proved.

Next, we prove the existence of a probability measure $P_{[X]} \colon \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}} \mapsto [0,1]$ on the space of intervals s.t. $P_{[X]}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = C_{[X]}([x])$. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the collection of all $B'([x],[y]) = \{[x'] \colon \underline{y} \leq \underline{x}' < \underline{x} \leq \overline{x} < \overline{x}' \leq \overline{y}\}$. Similar to Lemma 2, we have $B'([x],[y]) = \{[x]' \subseteq [y]\} \setminus \left[\{[x]' \subseteq [\underline{x}, \overline{y}]\} \cup \{[x]' \subseteq [\underline{y}, \overline{x}]\}\right]$. Then, define $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G} \cup \{\varnothing, \mathbb{I}\}$, and extend $C_{[X]}(\cdot)$ to a function $P_C(\cdot)$ on $\mathcal{H}$ s.t. $P_C(\varnothing) = 0$, $P_C(\mathbb{I}) = 1$, $P_C(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = C_{[X]}([x])$ and

$$P_C(B'([x],[y])) = C_{[X]}([y]) - C_{[X]}([\underline{x}, \overline{y}]) - C_{[X]}([\underline{y}, \overline{x}]) + C_{[X]}([x]) \geq 0,$$

by condition *iii)* of the definition of $C_{[X]}(\cdot)$ in Section 2.2. That is $P_C(\cdot)$ is non-negative.

In addition as $\mathbb{I}$ is locally compact, for any $A \subset \mathbb{I}$ and $\delta > 0$, there exists $E_1, \ldots, E_N \in \mathcal{H}$ with all $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(E_i) \leq \delta$, such that $A \subset \cup_{i=1}^{N} E_i$. Therefore, we can use Carathéodory construction (Durrett, 2010) to define a metric outer measure. Let $P^{\star}_{[X]}(A) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} P_{\delta}(A)$, where

$$P_{\delta}(A) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P_C(E_i) \colon E_i \in \mathcal{H},\, \mathrm{diam}(E_i) \leq \delta,\, \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \supseteq A \right\},$$

where $\mathrm{diam}(E_i)$ is the diameter of E_i. So, $P^{\star}_{[X]}(\cdot)$ is a metric outer measure, and thus the Borel subsets on $\mathbb{I}$ are measurable w.r.t. $P^{\star}_{[X]}(\cdot)$. That is, there exists a probability measure $P_{[X]} \colon \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}} \mapsto [0,1]$, such that $P_{[X]}(E) = P^{\star}_{[X]}(E)$ for any $E \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$.

Finally, we can check that $P_{[X]}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = C_{[X]}([x])$. For any $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, there exits $\delta_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, s.t. $P_{\delta_n}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) \leq C_{[X]}([\underline{x} - \frac{1}{n}, \overline{x} + \frac{1}{n}])$. Also $P_{\delta}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) \geq C_{[X]}([x])$ by definition for any $\delta > 0$. Therefore

$$C_{[X]}([x]) \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} P_{\delta_n}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} C_{[X]}([\underline{x} - 1/n, \overline{x} + 1/n]).$$

By condition *ii)* of the definition of $C_{[X]}(\cdot)$ in Section 2.2,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} C_{[X]}([\underline{x} - 1/n, \overline{x} + 1/n]) = C_{[X]}(\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} [\underline{x} - 1/n, \overline{x} + 1/n]) = C_{[X]}([x]).$$

Therefore,

$$P_{[X]}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} P_{\delta_n}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = C_{[X]}([x]).$$

As a result, given a random interval $[X] \colon \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{I}$, we obtain a probability measure $P \colon \sigma([X]) \mapsto [0,1]$, s.t. $P([X] \subseteq [x]) = P_{[X]}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = C_{[X]}([x])$. □

B.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. Let $C_{[X]}([x]) = F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$ be the containment functional. From Theorem 3 and its proof in Appendix B.3, it determines a unique probability measure $P_{[X]} \colon \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{I}} \mapsto [0,1]$ on the space of intervals s.t. $P_{[X]}([x]) = F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$. As $\mathrm{d}[x] = B_{\star}([x], [\underline{x} - \mathrm{d}\underline{x}, \overline{x} + \mathrm{d}\overline{x}])$, from (17) and (18),

$$B_{\star}([x], [\underline{x} - \mathrm{d}\underline{x}, \overline{x} + \mathrm{d}\overline{x}]) = W([\underline{x} - \mathrm{d}\underline{x}, \overline{x} + \mathrm{d}\overline{x}]) \setminus [W([\underline{x}, \overline{x} + \mathrm{d}\overline{x}]) \cup W([\underline{x} - \mathrm{d}\underline{x}, \overline{x}])].$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{[X]}(\mathrm{d}[x]) = P_{[X]}(W([\underline{x} - \mathrm{d}\underline{x}, \overline{x} + \mathrm{d}\overline{x}])) - P_{[X]}(W([\underline{x}, \overline{x} + \mathrm{d}\overline{x}])) - \\ P_{[X]}(W([\underline{x} - \mathrm{d}\underline{x}, \overline{x}])) + P_{[X]}(W([\underline{x}, \overline{x}])). \end{aligned}$$

By the continuity of the measure and $W([x]) = \cup_{n=k}^{\infty} \{[x]' \subseteq [\underline{x} + \frac{1}{n}, \overline{x} - \frac{1}{n}]\}$,

$$P_{[X]}(W([x])) = \lim_{\underline{x}' \to \underline{x}+} \lim_{\overline{x}' \to \overline{x}-} P_{[X]}([X] \subseteq [x]') = \lim_{\underline{x}' \to \underline{x}+} \lim_{\overline{x}' \to \overline{x}-} F_{[X]}(\underline{x}', \overline{x}').$$

As $F_{[X]}$ is twice differentiable (thus continuous), $P_{[X]}(W([x])) = F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$. Therefore,

$$P_{[X]}(\mathrm{d}[x]) = F_{[X]}(\underline{x} - \mathrm{d}\underline{x}, \overline{x} + \mathrm{d}\overline{x}) - F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x} + \mathrm{d}\overline{x}) - F_{[X]}(\underline{x} - \mathrm{d}\underline{x}, \overline{x}) + F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}).$$

Substituting second order Taylor expansions for the first three terms in the above equation, we obtain

$$P_{[X]}(\mathrm{d}[x]) = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \underline{x}\partial \overline{x}} F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}) \mathrm{d}\underline{x}\mathrm{d}\overline{x} + o(\mathrm{d}\underline{x}\mathrm{d}\overline{x}).$$

Note that $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathrm{d}[x]) = \mathrm{d}\underline{x}\mathrm{d}\overline{x}$ (Theorem 2), and so

$$P_{[X]}(\mathrm{d}[x]) = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \underline{x}\partial \overline{x}} F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}) \mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathrm{d}[x]) + o(\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathrm{d}[x])).$$

In addition, $P_{[X]}(\mathrm{d}[x]) = 0$ when $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathrm{d}[x]) = 0$, i.e. $P_{[X]}(\cdot)$ is absolute continuous w.r.t. $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\cdot)$. Therefore the the Radon-Nikodym derivative exists and

$$\frac{P_{[X]}(\mathrm{d}[x])}{\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathrm{d}[x])} = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \underline{x}\partial \overline{x}} F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}).$$

□

B.5 Proof of Theorem 5

Proof. For any function $f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$ satisfying the conditions in the theorem, we can construct its containment distribution function $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$ as

$$F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}) = \int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}} \int_{\underline{x}}^{b} f_{[X]}(a, b)\, \mathrm{d}a\mathrm{d}b \quad \text{or} \quad F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}) = \int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}} \int_{a}^{\overline{x}} f_{[X]}(a, b)\, \mathrm{d}b\mathrm{d}a.$$

It is easy to check that $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$ satisfies the conditions in Definition 1. □

B.6 Proof of Theorem 6

Proof. Let $c = \frac{a+b}{2} \in (-\infty, +\infty)$ and $r = \frac{b-a}{2} \geq 0$. We can rewrite (10) as

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|m) = 2^{-m} m(m-1)(\overline{x} - \underline{x})^{m-2} \iint_A r^{-m} g(c, r)\, \mathrm{d}c\mathrm{d}r,$$

where $g(c, r) = 2\pi(c - r, c + r)$ is the density function of (c, r) and $A = \{(c, r) \colon \overline{x} - r \leq c \leq \underline{x} + r, r \geq \frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2}\}$. As $\pi(\cdot)$ is bounded continuously, $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} g(c, r)\, \mathrm{d}c < \infty$. Let $g(r) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} g(c, r)\, \mathrm{d}c$, $B_0 = \{r \colon g(r) = 0\}$ and $B_1 = \{r \colon g(r) \neq 0\}$. When $g(r) \neq 0$, we have $g(c|r) = \frac{g(c,r)}{g(r)}$. The above integration can be decomposed into the following two cases. In the case that $g(r) \neq 0$, we replace $g(c, r)$ with $g(r)g(c|r)$ and integrate out c,

$$\iint_{A \cap B_1} r^{-m} g(c, r)\, \mathrm{d}c\mathrm{d}r = \int_{\frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2}}^{\infty} r^{-m} g(r) \left\{ \int_{\overline{x}-r}^{\underline{x}+r} g(c|r)\, \mathrm{d}c \right\} \mathrm{d}r.$$

In the case that $g(r) = 0$, we have $g(c, r) = 0$ and $\iint_{A \cap B_0} r^{-m} g(c, r)\, \mathrm{d}c\mathrm{d}r = 0$.

Then, writing $z = (m-1)(\log r - \log \frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2})$, we have

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|m) = \frac{1}{2} m(\overline{x}-\underline{x})^{-1} \times \int_0^\infty \mathrm{e}^{-z} g\left(\frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2}\mathrm{e}^{(m-1)^{-1}z}\right) \left\{ \int_{\overline{x}-\frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2}\mathrm{e}^{(m-1)^{-1}z}}^{\underline{x}+\frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2}\mathrm{e}^{(m-1)^{-1}z}} g\left(c|\frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2}\mathrm{e}^{(m-1)^{-1}z}\right) \mathrm{d}c \right\} \mathrm{d}z.$$

As $\pi(\cdot)$ is bounded continuously, $g(c,r) = 2\pi(c-r, c+r)$ is bounded continuously. Due to the mean value theorem, the above term can be simplified as

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|m) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty m \left\{ \mathrm{e}^{(m-1)^{-1}z} - 1 \right\} \mathrm{e}^{-z} g(\xi, \frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2}\mathrm{e}^{(m-1)^{-1}z}) \, \mathrm{d}z,$$

where $\underline{x} + \frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2}\mathrm{e}^{(m-1)^{-1}z} \le \xi \le \overline{x} - \frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2}\mathrm{e}^{(m-1)^{-1}z}$. Let $M(\xi) = \sup_{z\ge 0} g(\xi, \frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2}\mathrm{e}^{(m-1)^{-1}z})$. $M(\xi)$ is bounded as $g(c,r)$ is bounded. When $m \ge 3$, we have

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|m) \le \frac{M(\xi)}{2} \int_0^\infty m \left\{ \mathrm{e}^{(m-1)^{-1}z} - 1 \right\} \mathrm{e}^{-z} \, \mathrm{d}z = \frac{m}{2(m-2)} M(\xi) \le \frac{3}{2} M(\xi).$$

Therefore, $f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|m)$ is bounded when $m \to \infty$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m\to\infty} f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|m) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \lim_{m\to\infty} m \left\{ \mathrm{e}^{(m-1)^{-1}z} - 1 \right\} \mathrm{e}^{-z} g\left(\xi, \frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2}\mathrm{e}^{(m-1)^{-1}z}\right) \mathrm{d}z \\ &= \frac{1}{2} g\left(\frac{\underline{x}+\overline{x}}{2}, \frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2}\right) = \pi(\underline{x}, \overline{x}). \end{aligned}$$

□

B.7 Proof of Theorem 7

Proof. Let $f_{\mu,\tau} = f(\cdot|\mu,\tau)$, and denote $F_{\mu,\tau} = F(\cdot|\mu,\tau)$ and $Q_{\mu,\tau} = Q(\cdot;\mu,\tau)$ as its cumulative distribution function and quantile function, respectively. As $f_{\mu,\tau}$ is positive and continuous in the neighbourhoods of $Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p})$ and $Q_{\mu,\tau}(\overline{p})$ with $\underline{p} > 0$ and $\overline{p} < 1$, the joint density function of

$$\begin{cases} (m+1)^{\frac{1}{2}} f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p}))(\underline{X} - Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p})) \\ (m+1)^{\frac{1}{2}} f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\overline{p}))(\overline{X} - Q_{\mu,\tau}(\overline{p})) \end{cases}$$

converges pointwise to a bivariate normal density function, with zero mean and covariance matrix

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \underline{p}(1-\underline{p}) & \underline{p}(1-\overline{p}) \\ \underline{p}(1-\overline{p}) & \overline{p}(1-\overline{p}) \end{pmatrix}$$

when $m \to \infty$ (Reiss, 1989). Thus when m is large, the density function of the i.i.d. generative model (6) is asymptotically equivalent to

$$\frac{m+1}{2\pi|\Sigma|^{\frac{1}{2}}} f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p})) f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\overline{p})) \exp\{-(m+1)T(\underline{x}, \overline{x}; \mu, \tau)\},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T(\underline{x},\overline{x};\mu,\tau) =& \frac{1}{2}(\underline{t}(\underline{x};\mu,\tau),\overline{t}(\overline{x};\mu,\tau))\Sigma^{-1}(\underline{t}(\underline{x};\mu,\tau),\overline{t}(\overline{x};\mu,\tau))^{\intercal}, \\ \underline{t}(\underline{x};\mu,\tau) =& f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p}))(\underline{x}-Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p})), \\ \overline{t}(\overline{x};\mu,\tau) =& f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\overline{p}))(\overline{x}-Q_{\mu,\tau}(\overline{p})). \end{aligned}$$

That is, the density function of the hierarchical generative model (9) is asymptotically equivalent to

$$\frac{m+1}{2\pi|\Sigma|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \times H(\underline{x},\overline{x};\underline{p},\overline{p},m) \tag{19}$$

where

$$H(\underline{x},\overline{x};\underline{p},\overline{p},m) = \iint f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p}))f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\overline{p}))\pi(\mu,\tau)\exp\{-(m+1)T(\underline{x},\overline{x};\mu,\tau)\}\,\mathrm{d}\mu\mathrm{d}\tau.$$

Note that Σ is positive definite, and so $T(\underline{x},\overline{x};\mu,\tau) \geq 0$. Also $T(\underline{x},\overline{x};\underline{p},\overline{p},m)$ reaches its minimum 0, when $Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p}) = \underline{x}$ and $Q_{\mu,\tau}(\overline{p}) = \overline{x}$, i.e. μ and τ satisfy (11). As $f_{\mu,\tau}$ is interval-identifiable, (11) has a unique solution, and thus $T(\underline{x},\overline{x};\underline{p},\overline{p},m)$ is unimodal.

As $\mu_\star = \mu(\underline{x},\overline{x};\underline{p},\overline{p})$ and $\tau_\star = \tau(\underline{x},\overline{x};\underline{p},\overline{p})$ are the solution of (11), given conditions *i)* and *iii)* in the theorem, a Laplace approximation can be applied to $H(\underline{x},\overline{x};\underline{p},\overline{p},m)$ at the point $(\mu_\star,\tau_\star)$, giving

$$H(\underline{x},\overline{x};\underline{p},\overline{p},m) \approx 2\pi(m+1)^{-1}|\nabla^2 T(\underline{x},\overline{x};\mu_\star,\tau_\star)|^{-\frac{1}{2}} f_{\mu_\star,\tau_\star}(\underline{x})f_{\mu_\star,\tau_\star}(\overline{x})\pi(\mu_\star,\tau_\star). \tag{20}$$

We let $T = T(\underline{x},\overline{x};\mu,\tau)$, $\underline{t} = \underline{t}(\underline{x};\mu,\tau)$, $\overline{t} = \overline{t}(\overline{x};\mu,\tau)$ and $\Sigma^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{12} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix}$, so we have $T = \frac{1}{2}(a_{11}\underline{t}^2 + 2a_{12}\underline{t}\overline{t} + a_{22}\overline{t}^2)$. The first order partial derivatives of T are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial T}{\partial \mu} &= a_{11}\underline{t}\frac{\partial \underline{t}}{\partial \mu} + a_{12}\overline{t}\frac{\partial \underline{t}}{\partial \mu} + a_{12}\underline{t}\frac{\partial \overline{t}}{\partial \mu} + a_{22}\overline{t}\frac{\partial \overline{t}}{\partial \mu}, \\ \frac{\partial T}{\partial \tau} &= a_{11}\underline{t}\frac{\partial \underline{t}}{\partial \tau} + a_{12}\overline{t}\frac{\partial \underline{t}}{\partial \tau} + a_{12}\underline{t}\frac{\partial \overline{t}}{\partial \tau} + a_{22}\overline{t}\frac{\partial \overline{t}}{\partial \tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $T^\star$, $\underline{t}^\star$ and $\overline{t}^\star$ denote the corresponding functions and their derivatives taking values at $(\mu_\star,\tau_\star)$. As $\underline{t}^\star = \overline{t}^\star = 0$, the second order partial derivatives at $(\mu_\star,\tau_\star)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 T^\star}{\partial \mu^2} &= a_{11}\left(\frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu}\right)^2 + 2a_{12}\frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu}\frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu} + a_{22}\left(\frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu}\right)^2, \\ \frac{\partial^2 T^\star}{\partial \tau^2} &= a_{11}\left(\frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau}\right)^2 + 2a_{12}\frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau}\frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau} + a_{22}\left(\frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau}\right)^2, \\ \frac{\partial^2 T^\star}{\partial \mu \partial r} &= a_{11}\frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu}\frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau} + a_{12}\frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu}\frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau} + a_{12}\frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau}\frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu} + a_{22}\frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu}\frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\nabla^2 T$ at $(\mu_\star, \tau_\star)$ is

$$\nabla^2 T^\star = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu} & \frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau} \\ \frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu} & \frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau} \end{pmatrix}^\intercal \Sigma^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu} & \frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau} \\ \frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu} & \frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau} \end{pmatrix},$$

and its determinant is $|\nabla^2 g| = |\Sigma|^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu} \frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau} - \frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu} \right)^2$.

The derivatives of $\underline{t}$ and $\overline{t}$ at $(\mu^\star, \tau^\star)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu} &= -f_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\underline{x}) \times \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} Q_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\underline{p}), \\ \frac{\partial \underline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau} &= -f_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\underline{x}) \times \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Q_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\underline{p}), \\ \frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \mu} &= -f_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\overline{x}) \times \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} Q_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\overline{p}), \\ \frac{\partial \overline{t}^\star}{\partial \tau} &= -f_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\overline{x}) \times \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Q_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\overline{p}). \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$|\nabla^2 T^\star| = |\Sigma|^{-1} f_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\underline{x})^2 f_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\overline{x})^2 \left| J(\mu^\star, \tau^\star; \underline{p}, \overline{p}) \right|^2, \tag{21}$$

where

$$J(\mu^\star, \tau^\star; \underline{p}, \overline{p}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} Q_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\underline{p}) & \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Q_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\underline{p}) \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} Q_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\overline{p}) & \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Q_{\mu^\star,\tau^\star}(\overline{p}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

From (20) and (21), we obtain that the density function of the hierarchical generative model (19) converges pointwise to $\pi(\mu^\star, \tau^\star) \left| J(\mu^\star, \tau^\star; \underline{p}, \overline{p}) \right|^{-1}$. □

B.8 Proof of Theorem 8 and 9

Proof. Similar to the proof of Theorem 4 and 5. Use Lemma 4 and Taylor expansions. □

B.9 Likelihood function of two dimension i.i.d. generative model

Let $[\boldsymbol{X}] = [X_1] \times [X_2]$ be the random rectangle generated from m i.i.d. bivariate latent data points from $f(x_1, x_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with the data aggregation function taking the minimum and maximum values at each margin. Let $F(x_1, x_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ be the distribution function of $f(x_1, x_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})$. The distribution function of $[X_1] \times [X_2]$ is

$$F_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \left[F(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\overline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) + F(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right]^m.$$

This is the probability that all m latent data points fall within the rectangle $[x_1] \times [x_2]$. From Theorem 8, the likelihood function is the fourth order mixed derivative as shown

below

$$
\begin{aligned}
&f_{[\boldsymbol{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
=&m(m-1)(m-2)(m-3)\left\{F(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\overline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) + F(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\}^{m-4} \times \\
&\int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\overline{x}_1} f(y_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\mathrm{d}y_1 \int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\overline{x}_1} f(y_2, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\mathrm{d}y_2 \int_{\underline{x}_2}^{\overline{x}_2} f(\underline{x}_1, y_3|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\mathrm{d}y_3 \int_{\underline{x}_2}^{\overline{x}_2} f(\overline{x}_1, y_4|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\mathrm{d}y_4 + \\
&m(m-1)(m-2)\left\{F(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\overline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) + F(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\}^{m-3} \times \\
&\Bigg\{f(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\overline{x}_1} f(y_2, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\mathrm{d}y_2 \int_{\underline{x}_2}^{\overline{x}_2} f(\overline{x}_1, y_4|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\mathrm{d}y_4 + \\
&f(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\overline{x}_1} f(y_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\mathrm{d}y_1 \int_{\underline{x}_2}^{\overline{x}_2} f(\overline{x}_1, y_4|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\mathrm{d}y_4 + \\
&f(\overline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\overline{x}_1} f(y_2, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\mathrm{d}y_2 \int_{\underline{x}_2}^{\overline{x}_2} f(\underline{x}_1, y_3|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\mathrm{d}y_3 + \\
&f(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\overline{x}_1} f(y_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\mathrm{d}y_1 \int_{\underline{x}_2}^{\overline{x}_2} f(\underline{x}_1, y_3|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\mathrm{d}y_3\Bigg\} + \\
&m(m-1)\left\{F(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\overline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) + F(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\}^{m-2} \times \\
&\Bigg\{f(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) + f(\underline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\overline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})\Bigg\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Although it is rather complex, in fact it has a similar intuitive interpretation to (7). The first term denotes the case that $m-4$ points fall within $[x_1] \times [x_2]$ while the remaining four points are $(y_1, \underline{x}_2)$, $(y_2, \overline{x}_2)$, $(\underline{x}_1, y_3)$ and $(\overline{x}_1, y_4)$, where $\underline{x}_1 \leq y_1, y_2 \leq \overline{x}_1$ and $\underline{x}_2 \leq y_3, y_4 \leq \overline{x}_2$. The second term represents the case that $m-3$ points fall within $[x_1] \times [x_2]$ while the remaining three points determine the boundary of the rectangle. The last terms is the case the boundary is formed by only two points.